DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 443 HE 033 203

AUTHOR	Woodruff, Jennifer E.
TITLE	Voices of Change: Women's Experiences at Lake Forest College, 1955-1975.
PUB DATE	2000-04-28
NOTE	127p.; Senior Thesis, Lake Forest College.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Athletics; Civil Rights; College Faculty; College Students; *Equal Education; *Females; Higher Education; *Sex Discrimination; *Social Change; Student Rights; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Lake Forest College IL

ABSTRACT

This study examines the experiences of women at Lake Forest College, Illinois, from 1955-75 through questionnaires sent to women alumni and present and past faculty and staff requesting information on demographics, academic/extracurricular activities, campus life, social and political change, career expectations, and attitudes. Chapter 1 sketches the general history of Lake Forest College. Chapter 2 describes the years from 1955-65, a generally very conservative period with rules governing many aspects of women's lives. Things began to change at the end of this period, as the campus reacted to the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Kennedy's assassination, the gathering momentum of the civil rights movement, enrollment of liberal students from the East, and the Vietnam War. Chapter 3 examines the years between 1965-75, a key period during which the campus experienced drastic changes sparked by national movements. The civil rights movement expanded, the Vietnam War escalated, the peace movement began, and the women's movement emerged. Women struggled to change their lives, abolishing dress codes and dorm rules, fighting for education about and the right to have birth control and abortions, and pushing for equality in athletics. Appended are a list of questionnaire respondents and the survey instrument. (Contains 218 references.) (SM)

LAKE FOREST COLLEGE

Senior Thesis

Voices of Change:
Women's Experiences at Lake Forest College, 1955-1975

by

Jennifer E. Woodruff

April 28, 2000

The report of the investigation undertaken as a Senior Thesis,
to carry two courses of credit in the Department of History

Steven Galovich
Provost and Dean of the Faculty

(Chairperson)
Michael Ebner

Carol Gayle

Arthur Miller

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter One	1
Chapter Two	19
Chapter Three	59
Conclusion	107
Appendix I	111
Appendix II	116
Bibliography	123

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to whom I owe a great many thanks. Foremost I would like to thank the women who took the time to respond to my questionnaire. Without their help this project would not have been possible. The letters and words of advice or encouragement they provided were both helpful and inspirational. I would also like to offer a great many thanks my cheering squad, otherwise known as my thesis committee, for their unending support and help. Michael Ebner met with me weekly to advise and guide me through this process. He, more than anyone, was witness to the many moods I have gone through as I worked on this project! Carol Gayle was my greatest editor, spending hours reading my chapters. She was extremely encouraging, and as a woman faculty member who was present on the campus for part of the period I studied, she provided insights I could not have otherwise gleamed. Arthur Miller, whom I was employed by for one and a half years, inspired me to chose this topic, as I helped research for the college history. He spent a great deal of time guiding me to the readily available materials in the archives and fine-tuning the historical details of my paper. Thank you to the History Department, which generously funded my questionnaire. Thank you also to my other professors, such as Christopher Reed and Jean Luc Garneau, who were understanding of my need to sometimes put my thesis ahead of my other responsibilities. I would also like to thank my friends and family, who have supported and encouraged me.

CHAPTER ONE

In many ways, the roles of women at Lake Forest College, reaching back to its origins in the nineteenth century, correspond to general patterns of coeducational institutions in the United States. Traditionally women were governed by a strict set of rules concerning their living space, their dress, and their sexuality. Stringent expectations dictated what most would do after graduating. I wanted to know how, why, and when this pattern was displaced. My study examines a twenty-year span, 1955-1975, which were years of great change for women in American society and on college campuses. From this research I have learned about what changed, as well as what did not change, in the lives of women who attended Lake Forest College.

A large part of my thesis is based on the information gathered from questionnaires that I sent to women alumni and faculty and staff, present and past. First, I sent 35 questionnaires as a beta test to members from all classes (and thus I have a few surveys from women who graduated before 1955 or after 1975), and I received ten back. Then, I sent out 25 questionnaires to a random sample of each class that graduated between the years 1955 through 1975, and also a few to people who were recommended to me. From these 500 plus, I received 86 back. I also sent questionnaires to women who taught or worked on staff at the College between 1955 and 1975, 19 in total, and 10 were returned to me. My overall return rate was approximately 20 percent. These questionnaires have proven to be invaluable to my study. They mentioned stories not found in the *Stentor* and contained amusing anecdotes. Close study of the survey responses shows a wide variety of attitudes represented at any one given time, but one can also sense changing perceptions towards campus or societal issues. I have used these women's voices to tell

the story of the College. After all, who knows better what it was like to be a woman on the Lake Forest College campus than the women themselves?

This first chapter sketches in the general history of the College, focusing on women's lives. It amounts to a sampler of what women were doing during the early years of the College's history. Its purpose is to give a sense of the time. Resources for this chapter range from histories, especially a draft of the new college history, entitled *Thirty Miles North*,[1] through contemporary documents such as rulebooks, scrapbooks, and the College newspaper, the *Stentor*,[2] to a handful of questionnaires from women who attended the College during this period. Women students at the College during its first eight decades ranged from progressive to conservative, from academically inclined to high society women-in-training, and their stories are evidence of this. Yet women played a large role, making Lake Forest a coeducational institution "with attitude" from the outset. Several anecdotes document strong support by women and a feisty progressiveness among many alumnae.

Chapter Two describes the years from 1955 through 1965. This was a period that showed inklings of the floodtide of change that was to come in later, but was generally very conservative. Rules were in place for women, governing many aspects of their lives. Academic life and future plans for life after graduation were very traditional: women were often English majors and taught for awhile, but they were usually married soon after graduating. Sports were not considered important, with inter-sorority competition and physical education classes for women were the norm. Then, things began to change on campus as they were changing in the larger society. People's vision of the United States were altered as the Eisenhower era of conservative, anti-Communist

thought ended with the election of President Kennedy, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and then the shock of Kennedy's assassination. But the change came not only at the political level; it flowed through the social and cultural levels too. As the civil rights movement gathered momentum, awareness about the national sororities' discriminatory policies led to their eventual demise at the College, although many were reborn as local sororities. As more liberal students began coming to the College from the east, and as the war in Vietnam began, a distinctive group representing alternative cultural values began to appear on the campus. The "Beatniks" caused a commotion, upsetting those comfortable with traditional ways of doing things. Also, the birth control pill became available during this period and, although women said they did not discuss what they were doing, it was a period of increased sexual experimentation and freedom.

Chapter Three covers the time between 1965 and 1975 in which the campus experienced drastic changes, sparked by nationwide movements. The era saw the escalation of the Vietnam War and the ensuing response of the peace movement, the expansion of the civil rights movement, the emergence of the women's movement, and all of the changes that accompanied these three impetuses of change. Women struggled to change their lives, by giving themselves the control over the rules they lived by and over their bodies, and also by carving out a larger place on campus for women's activities. They succeeded in getting rid of dress codes and dorm rules, including curfews. They also fought for education about and the right to have birth control and abortions. The sports arena was another battleground, as women fought for equality in athletics. Sororities were disbanded for a time, because what they stood for did not fit what was culturally acceptable in the era of the hippies. Women became aware of their

societal roles at this time; many rebelled against tradition. Women waited to get married, and many pursued careers. It was a drastically different period than had ever been seen on the Lake Forest College campus, or other campuses across the country.

* * * *

Originally founded in 1857, Lake Forest College's "second founding"[3] in 1876 is an appropriate beginning to a history of women's roles at the institution. Lake Forest resident Mary Eveline Smith Farwell, wife of Senator Charles Farwell, desired to see her daughter Anna receive an education that no existing foundation could offer a woman. As a major backer of the revival of the College after a hiatus, she insisted that it accept women as well as men. Thus, she became the founder of one of the first co-educational institutions in the country; she was a woman who, according to historian John J. Halsey "grasped...an educational idea that was then novel and almost untried, and she had the faith to put it into practice." Her daughter proved herself worthy of this new institution, becoming the first graduating class's valedictorian in 1880. Anna Farwell's beliefs were progressive for her time: "In the modern [world, women's] position is independent, and for the extension of her sphere and the development of her capacities ever increasing possibilities are opened.... To-day, Universities open their doors to her; on the stage and in literature she wields a strong and purifying influence, and in the professions she takes her place—all possibilities are hers."[4] She took advantage of these possibilities, leading a successful career as a writer.[5]

Lake Forest College had separate spaces for men and women, even though it was

a coeducational institution. A 1960s historian of the College, Ruth Sproat, wrote that the trustees included a limitation when they "voted that the college would be open to students of both sexes. The young ladies...would only be present in the college building for recitation, appearance for any other reason would require special permission."[6] In the 1880s and 1890s women lived at home, with sponsor families in Lake Forest, or at Ferry Hall or Mitchell Hall. The main dormitory for women, Lois Durand Hall on North Campus, was not completed until 1899. Once it was built, men and women continued to live in distinct, separate spheres, housed on different campuses, women on North Campus and men across the ravine on what is now Middle Campus. They each dined in their own facilities, the women's being located in Lois. Women did not dine in Commons with the men until the mid-1930s.[7]

There were two women-only secondary institutions that were associated with the College and its preparatory school. These were Dickinson's Seminary for Young Ladies (1859-1867) and Ferry Hall (1869-1973). The first is described in John J. Halsey's *History of Lake County* (1912):

> In September, 1859, the Rev. Baxter Dickinson, D.D...with the assistance of his four daughters, opened a Seminary for Young Ladies. For nine years this school was one of the most widely known in the West, and its graduates helped to make many of the leading homes of this section. In the course of its career this school educated some four hundred young women. While Mr. Dickinson's school was not a branch of the university system, being housed and conducted at his own expense, he was led to locate it in Lake Forest because of the prospective university, and it was in every sense a forerunner of the present Ferry Hall.[8]

In 1869, two years after Dickinson's seminary closed, Ferry Hall opened. It was a "ladies" seminary affiliated with Lake Forest College. Sixty-six students attended in its first year of operation. For a short time, the old Dickinson home was used as a girls' preparatory school for Ferry Hall.[9] At Ferry Hall, which was regarded as a "finishing school," in addition to academic courses, "sewing, embroidery, and physical culture"

were offered. In 1894 Anna Freeman Davies wrote about Ferry Hall in the *Stentor*, explaining that "at best the girls' boarding school as usually conducted is bad enough, and furnishes almost irresistible material for caricature. It is, however, what public opinion and parental opinion call for, and can be improved only as better home training and broader views of a girl's character and life [are obtained] in the community at large."[10]

Mary Farwell's forward-thinking creation of an institution at which "a woman might gain an education such as men enjoyed"[11] gave parents another local option. Those who desired for their daughters to have a more traditional education for women sent their children to the women-only institutions. Young women who came from more liberal families attended the college. Both institutions ventured into uncharted territory. For example, Lake Forest College, represented by Mitchell Hall, and Ferry Hall were two of the first institutions in the country to have women's basketball teams. An 1896 *Forester* sketch of Mitchell Hall's team shows how the women were perceived: one woman is shown fixing her hair, and another is lying sprawled out flat on the ground. Various male characters watch from above, looking amused.[12] Perhaps this is why, in February of 1896, men were not allowed to attend "the first contest of its kind between women that has ever been played in a western college," even though they were willing to pay ten times the admission price. The score of this match was zero-zero, and afterward the women remarked that "one side or the other had been guilty of 'slugging' and other unmeritorious conduct."[13]

The tradition of academic excellence among women was continued in these early years by Josephine White, salutatorian of Anna Farwell's class, and others. White, like

Farwell, had a successful career as an author. In 1880 the Chicago newspaper *Interior* reported that the "practical proof of the success of the coeducation theory [was] so well illustrated in these scholarly and accomplished young ladies."[14] Anna Davies, class of 1889, quoted above, was the valedictorian of her class, and went on to become a pioneer social worker in Philadelphia. She received encouragement from and followed in the footsteps of Jane Addams, who was connected to the College.[15] Florence Raymond, class of 1891, was a high-profile golfer in her time, who also taught at the Elgin Academy. Her decision to be a career woman meant that she would remain single until she retired from teaching, which she did when she was in her fifties, at which time she married the headmaster of the Academy.[16]

Women played another, crucial and heretofore unnoted, role in the early history of the College. Their money and support played a large role in the naming or construction of buildings on the campus. The Dickinson home was purchased by the Farwell family, and Mary named this first women's dormitory at the College in 1881 in honor of Maria Mitchell, "'her dear friend,' the eminent astronomer and faculty member at Vassar College."[17] Lois Durand Hall was donated by Henry C. Durand, in memory of his mother, and Alice Home Hospital was named after Henry Durand's wife's sister, Alice Burhams.[18] The Eliza Remsen Cottage, on South Campus (used by the College between 1947-1965), was named as a memorial for the sister of trustee Ezra Warner's spouse. More significant was the direct donation of buildings by women. Martha McWilliams (Mrs. Simon) Reid donated two buildings: the Arthur Somerville Reid Memorial Library, built in 1899-1900, in memory of her son, class of 1897, and also the Lily Reid Holt Chapel, built in 1899-1900, in memory of her daughter, class of 1884. Mrs. Reid also

contributed to Blackstone Hall (1907). The new men's dorms mainly were funded by Mrs. Timothy Blackstone. One was named for her husband, the other for President Harlan.[19]

Sometimes the source of funds for buildings was obvious, but other times it was not as clear. Men were often dependent on, yet in control of, their wife's family's money. In the end, the men were the ones who received credit for the donations as well. Women can be found to have an influence in the Farwell family's money. Mr. Cooley was a wealthy man who ran a dry goods business in Chicago. Young John V. Farwell joined him, and married his daughter, thus marrying into the money as well. In 1864 J.V. Farwell turned over control of the firm to his brother, Charles Farwell. Charles and his spouse, Mary, used this money to help found and build Lake Forest College. The Farwell family paid for the construction of Young, North, and Hotchkiss Halls.[20] A further example is that of Walter Cranston Larned, whose wife was the granddaughter of John Insley Blair, a railroad robber barron. The $10,000 Larned contributed to the building of the Durand Art Institute came from his wife's family.[21] Yet another example is Clifford Barnes, who married Alice Reid, an 1880s alumna, who became heiress to the Reid grocery fortune when two of Martha Reid's children, including the sole male heir, died. Barnes was reported by Richard Hantke to have told faculty member Solly Harzto that if a professor did not already have his own money, he should do what Barnes had done: marry it.[22] The Barnes family owned Glen Rowan, which was bought in the 1960s by the College from the couple's daughter, Lilace Barnes. Thus, women were crucial to early patronage of the College by nearby families.

The 1910s brought a new era for women with the Gibson Girl: clothing was more simple, bustles were not worn, and skirts were slightly shorter. Very traditional and strict rules were still place, but women were starting to change. The archives contain three scrapbooks from women who graduated during this ten-year period. The scrapbook of Emma Bockhoff, class of 1915, contained a rulebook for Lois Hall, which showed how specific and miniscule the rules could be. Underneath her copy of *The Student Government Association of Lois Durand Hall's Constitution*, Bockhoff wrote: "this is why we were good." Besides house rules, there were also "house customs," which dictated many aspects of student behavior:

> After evening entertainments no discussion shall take place in the halls.... Girls must not walk noisily in the halls and must wear soft slippers after 7:30 p.m. and before 6:30 a.m.... Quiet must be preserved from 10:00 p.m. on week days, and 9:00 p.m. on Sundays until the rising bell, during which no baths are to be taken.... Dressing sacques may be worn at breakfast only. Custom demands that they be belted.... No student shall be expected to invite her escort in after returning from an entertainment.

There were many other rules, such as the requirement for women to have chaperones for theater and evening party events in Chicago; furthermore if no chaperones were present for other activities, women had to leave by 8 p.m. Significantly for Margaret Horton's story (told next), no woman was allowed out of the house after 7:00 p.m. without permission; the time was extended by one hour after spring vacation.[23] The breaking of this rule caused quite a stir for some women.

Class of 1919 member Margaret W. Horton's scrapbook gave a picture of a rebellious student. She included in her scrapbook a comic strip with the silhouette of a young man and woman, close together on a porch, and a person leaning out of the door and saying: "Marguerite, it's time to come in now!" A panel of the strip asked: "Is this your little pet peeve?" She answered by writing "too true" and "many times." There was also a photograph of her at the beach, with the caption: "when I played hooky one

morning." For one night of fun, she broke the rules and was punished accordingly, managing to make international headlines in the process. In a small envelope that held an unmarked newspaper article was written: "Just for one night's joy! And how worth it!!" Next to another article she wrote "what caused a lot of trouble and went all over the country and even to Europe."[24] The scandal involved four women, two of them freshmen, who sneaked out of the dorm via the fire escape to go to a dance. The punishment for the two freshmen women was that they could not "leave the campus for two weeks. No dances; no conversations with boys; no ice cream parties with other girls in town." Margaret Horton and the fourth woman were restricted to their dorms after 7:00 p.m. for one week. The women did not readily accept this. "At Lake Forest college the students complain they are being treated like kindergartners.... At Lake Forest college there is much comment on those rules."[25] *The Chicago Tribune* wrote: "The Campus Maiden's prayer—as rendered by the girls of Lake Forest college, weary of the blue laws: 'Dear Weather Prophet: Please send rain, and make the sun hide under a cloud, and make the wind to be still. And, O Prophet, I beseach, make the shores of Lake Michigan to be dreary and joyless. Amen.'... And the Campus Maiden's prayer is very popular."[26]

The scrapbook belonging to Dorothy M. Cooper, class of 1917, contained an eloquent pamphlet letter to the faculty, explaining the position of women who objected to a faculty decision to abolish sororities on the campus. The women contested the "lame and untenable" reasons cited for the professors' decision, among them the belief that unaffiliated women were excluded from living on the second floor of Lois Hall, and that friendships were broken once sophomores who joined sororities were asked to live with their sorority sisters. It was also said that some "men have not wished to have their sisters

come to Lake Forest and this fact has been used as an argument against the Sororities." The women rejected these claims and proceeded to explain that sororities were necessary on the campus, serving as organizers of social life and ties the alumnae to the College.[27] The students won the argument, as sororities remained and flourished through the 1950s. In general, even when colleges disbanded sororities, fraternities were allowed to exist; colleges claimed they had to protect their female students. This instance shows that women at Lake Forest were capable of fending for themselves.

In the 1920s and 1930s roles did change to some extent, as liberties were gained concerning clothing and sex. But it was also an era in which few women challenged traditional structures in family and employment. Sorority involvement was high, and dances, serenades, and pinnings were hot topics in the *Stentor*, and tiny dance books and notes from beaus filled the women's scrapbooks as mementos from these events. A particularly ornate dance book, from the late 1930s, when the Depression's harsh effects were still felt in some quarters, is evidence of the economically privileged position of some Lake Forest College students. Its cover was of gray leather, embossed with an elaborate frame. Inside the cover were sheets of delicate rice paper, inviting one to turn through the pages of dance numbers and addresses.[28] Even faculty kept high standards during the Depression years, according to the wife of a member of the Mathematics Department, Margaret Curtis: "The faculty was quite conservative though we were very social.... Mrs. Moore, the President's wife, frequently ended her luncheons with finger bowls and we learned how to set aside the little glass bowl on the lace doily and use it daintily."[29]

Women's social standing was a high priority for most students during this period, but there were also serious, academically-inclined students who continued the tradition of fine women graduates begun by Anna Farwell and Josephine White. Mary Longbrake, class of 1935, was a member of the Alpha Xi Delta sorority. She did not have the money for dues, but the sorority wanted her as a member because of her high grades (she did manage to pay her dues, however). Her "only pledge duty was to get two of my sorority sisters through Trigonometry. One was taking it for the second time and the other for the third! They all passed this time."[30] Women during this time were more complex than a skim through the *Stentor* would lead one to believe. Looking at the student newspaper for information about what women's lives were like during this time, one would think that all women were *only* interested in dating, dances, serenades and being pinned, the topics most frequently mentioned. One woman made this point abundantly clear in a 1920 letter to the *Stentor*:

> "The poor co-ed"...is right. The way she has been maligned is terrible. Now, taking the law of averages into consideration, it seems that contributors to this paper have forgotten that such a rule ever existed or did exist. Do you think girls on this campus think only of the good times they can get? Do you not suppose they have a sensible idea in their heads? From recent articles conclusions one might draw are not very favorable to the feminine members of this campus.

She continued by debunking the idea that women only wanted men for their money and that men can learn a method to kiss an "unkissable" girl: "If a girl wants to be kissed, kissed she will be, and if she doesn't, why, she won't be."[31]

Strong pressures to conform faced women who were different. During the winter of 1920 a male student complained about women wearing unclasped galoshes across campus, calling them "the most disgusting new [idea] that has struck this campus in a long while."[32] A woman responded, exclaiming that he must have been "hard up" for a story to have chosen such a topic. She explained "the thrill" women derived from

wearing something men found to be disgusting: "When galoshes are closed they are just ugly overshoes despised in our childhood days but when they are open—only the fortunate few can understand."[33] In 1939 there was a story about "a gal in Lois Hall who has a pair of knee-length socks. She gets up every morning, puts them on, loses her nerve, and takes them off again." The *Stentor* took a poll to see what public opinion had to say about the matter; the response to this East Coast craze was not positive.[34] One female student's atypical attitude may have been cultivated during the two year period she attended Smith College before coming to Lake Forest. At Lake Forest College she found a different style of dressing than she was used to: "Girls all wore skirts, stockings, heels—even to class. [They] marveled at my wearing ski pants and boots in winter, casual loafers and sweat sox. [Their] attitude was: 'easy enough for you to do, you're already engaged.' I was amused, that had nothing to do with it."[35] As a former student at an eastern women's college, she fit into *their* norm of dressing in an unconventional way: "Sloppy dress served as a uniform to mark the Vassar or Wellesley student, setting her apart from other college women."[36]

With the onset of World War II, women's lives were transformed dramatically. Their memories of the campus were very vivid. It was a monumental era, and people living during that time knew it. Many of their memories involve the soldiers of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) who took classes "essential to their candidacy as potential officers."[37] Victoria L. Kolb, class of 1946, told the story of an ASTP bugler whose taps she would echo, "on occasion, from the Lois Durand Hall dorm window." She also recalled how the soldiers marching to class forced the women to "jump out of their way—sometimes onto the wet, muddy and slushy grass around us."

After the women complained, things changed: "Whenever these platoons approached a group of us on the sidewalks the officers in command shouted orders and THEY gallantly detoured onto that wet, muddy and slushy grass around us. How important and placated we felt!" Kolb described how people felt when the ASTP soldiers left:

> It was a deeply emotional experience for everyone when the program was abruptly canceled and many of these select young men were sent directly into combat duty seemingly without proper training. The whole student body marched to the train depot downtown to bid them farewell—students waving from the depot boardwalk and soldiers waving from every window of the train. [38]

With their former companions off fighting, "MAIL was the big event every day. Since the military group was stationed on campus for a year and a half, they had become close friends. The mail often brought sad news."[39] It was a drastically different college atmosphere than had ever been present before, as one 1947 graduate recalled:

> It is difficult to explain how totally World War II dominated our lives.... Food, gasoline, travel by train or plane, were all rationed. We had to bring our food ration books to school and turn them over to Commons for use during the school year. Windows had to be darkened at night. Everyone had family members in the service and the news of any of them being injured or killed came all too often. [40]

Women not only observed the events of the war from the sidelines. "Many of us volunteered every Friday evening at the USO center in Waukegan, and occasionally at Fort Sheridan. We also were involved in war-related volunteer work in the town of Lake Forest."[41] Some women participated by working for the Red Cross, or the army or navy.[42] Betty Grimes, class of 1942, "kept personal records of hundreds of women who actually filled a soldier's place. No matter whether they were mechanics or clerks they all contributed something to the effort."[43] Mary Longbrake described her experience in the Navy:

> The women's movement emerged much before the 1960's for me. I was in the first class for naval officers in World War II, serving for four years and attaining the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. I was the only head of a department in my section, but never felt harassed or discriminated against. I just worked like the very dickens and loved it! [44]

Alice Blacker Slingluff, class of 1936, died "from complications of an illness contracted in New Guinea," where she served as a canteen worker. "[E]ven while Japanese bombs shook Port Moresby, [she] served coffee and dough-nuts to American fighting men."[45] Phyllis Eaholm Carper's life was impacted greatly by the war:

> I was greatly affected by World War II. My summer job as a welder to help the war effort was one thing. Plus, I felt that by becoming a nurse [if] I could save even one life, all my work would be worthwhile. I was quite idealistic—as most young people are. At the close of the war I joined the army nurse corps—the country was [soon] off on another war—Korea.[46]

The 1940s produced a different type of woman, out of necessity. In 1943, one strategy was to offer female high school honor students a chance to attend college with a full scholarship:[47]

> I had a four-year scholarship. There were thirty women awarded scholarships at LFC by the Johns-Manville Corporation. Their purpose was to develop women able to assume management positions. Twice a week we attended business classes at the J-M sales office in Chicago or the manufacturing facility in Waukegan. We actually were trained "on the job" in all phases of their operations. We also were given guidance in grooming, speech, behavior, etc.[48]

These women "added to the quality of the women's enrollment, which remained numerically steady during the war."[49] Even those who were not selected to be Manville Girls attended the College and received partial scholarships, as Phyllis Eaholm Carper, class of 1948, did.[50]

While men were fighting in World War II women took on roles with greater responsibilities to fill the void:

> We...felt deprived of a "normal" college life at a co-educational college.... Overall the women on campus tried to keep as many activities as possible going. It is my feeling that we did a pretty good job. Because of World War II the social atmosphere was different.... The situation while I attended LFC actually constituted a women's movement—not by choice—but by necessity. Roles and responsibilities heretofore considered belonging to men now were taken over by women. Undoubtedly, more men would have held leadership positions in organizations such as the Student Council, the *Stentor* and the *Forester*. As a result the diverse abilities and talents of women were recognized. This may actually have been the beginning of the women's movement of the '60s.[51]

When the war was over, men returned to the College, and women resumed their traditional roles. Life, however, did not completely return to normal, because of the veterans who became students:

> The returning veterans our junior year changed the whole social atmosphere on campus. Married students were a new presence, too. The men coming back were older, more serious about their education and their relationships. Of necessity, during our freshman and sophomore years, women, for the most part, headed all student activities. I don't remember any great feeling of displacement when male students began to move into leadership positions. [52]

But women, too, had changed. They now understood their capabilities. Greater equality would have to wait until their daughters' generation came of age in the 1960s:

> No women's movement was afoot for my generation. Many thought a career for a woman was a weird idea. You were supposed to go to college to meet a man, get married, have kids and be a good little housewife. I really had to fight (even my parents) for my career. My summer job boss advised me to drop nursing and college--be a welder and get married! One former ASTP came back from the war and asked me to marry him, but I was in nurses training by then and declined.[53]

During the fifties, people struggled to recapture the normal lives of the prewar decades. But the more conservative fifties actually proved but an interlude preceding the radical changes of the sixties.

[1] Franz Schulze, Rosemary Cowler, Arthur Miller. *Thirty Miles North: The History of Lake Forest College, Its Town, and Its City of Chicago* (Chicago: Lake Forest College, distributed by the University of Chicago Press, 2000).
[2] Stephen K. Vignocchi's *Index to the Stentor,* Vol. 1, 1887-1920, October 1992, is an excellent beginning to any study done of the early years of Lake Forest College.
[3] The College actually began with the name Lind University, popularly known as Lake Forest University, in 1857. It did not permanently become a college until 1876. For the details to the events that led to a short hiatus, see Schulze, *Thirty Miles North.*
[4] Anna Farwell, "The Position and Opportunities of Woman in America," *Lake Forest University Review,* (Vol. 1, No. 6, June 1880) 66-67.
[5] Schulze, *Thirty Miles North*, 33.
[6] Ruth C. Sproat, "Lake Forest College: the College and its Founders," graduate paper, (Northwestern University, June 5, 1962) 40.
[7] Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College archivist, personal interview, April 2000.
[8] John J. Halsey, *The History of Lake County, IL* (1912) 621.
[9] Wm. B. Hunt, "A Brief History of Ferry Hall," *Stentor,* (Vol. 7, No. 20, March 20, 1894) 3-4.
[10] Anna Freeman Davies, "Addenda Et Corrigenda" to "A Brief History of Ferry Hall," *Stentor* (Vol. 7, No. 27, May 15, 1894) 5-6.
[11] Halsey, 622.
[12] *The Forester,* [Lake Forest University yearbook,] (Vol III, 1896) 84-85, 130-131.
[13] "First 'Co-ed' Basket-ball Game," *Stentor* (Vol. 9, No. 16, February 18, 1896) 2-3.
[14] Schulze, *Thirty Miles North,* 34.
[15] Schulze, *Thirty Miles North*, 76. With a brother-in-law working for and nephew attending Lake Forest College in the 1880s and 1890s, she apparently visited on several occasions. One talk she gave to Ferry Hall is mentioned in the *Stentor* (1/15/94, p. 8), and Arthur Miller reports she also spoke at the College later. Addams's connection to the College would be an interesting topic worthy of further research.
[16] Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College archivist, personal interview, April 2000.
[17] Arthur Miller, "History of Lake Forest," *The Journal: Lake Forest* (Vol. 6, No. 10, July 1998) 2-5.
[18] Lois Barnes Durand was a farm wife in upstate New York. She was descended from Eliha Yale, founder of Yale University. (Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College archivist, personal interview, April 2000.)
[19] Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College's Historic Campus: Landscape and Buildings, Lake Forest College webpage, http://www.lib.lfc.edu/special/histcampus.html.
[20] Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College archivist, personal interview, April 2000.
[21] Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College archivist, personal interview, April 2000.
[22] Richard Hantke, interview by Arthur Miller, June 28, 1995.
[23] *Constitution of the Student House Government Association of Lois Durand Hall* (c. 1911), p. 7-8. Found in Emma Bockhoff's Lake Forest College scrapbook, Class of 1915, Lake Forest College Archives.
[24] Margaret W. Horton, class of 1919, Lake Forest College scrapbook, Lake Forest College Archives.
[25] "LAKE FOREST CO-EDS 'JAILED' BY BLUE LAWS, But, the Faculty Says, Students Made Those Rules," Newspaper source unknown, c. April, 1919. Found in Margaret W. Horton, Class of 1919, Lake Forest College scrapbook, Lake Forest College Archives.
[26] "LAKE FOREST COLLEGE GIRLS BLUE OVER BLUE LAWS, Some Young Women Restricted to Campus and Others Find Their Freedom Menaced," *Chicago Tribune,* April 13, 1919. Found in Margaret W. Horton's scrapbook, Class of 1919, Lake Forest College Archives.
[27] *A letter to the faculty of Lake Forest College, June, 1916,* 7-8. Found in Dorothy M. Cooper, 1917, scrapbook, Lake Forest College Archives.
[28] *Beta Rho of Alpha Delta Pi, Triennial Formal Dance Book*, March 24, 1939. [Donated by Al Jeane Kern Beach, Class of 1940.]
[29] Quote from unpublished notes from a talk by Mrs. Margaret Curtis to the Lake Forest College Campus Circle, Fall, 1977, p.9. Found in Eric R. Riedel, "Lake Forest College: The Depression Years, 1928-1936," graduate paper (University of Chicago) Lake Forest College Archives.
[30] Mary Longbrake, 1935, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[31] "The Co-ed Doesn't Like Being Hit; She Comes in With a Right," *Stentor* (Vol. 44, No. 10, November 26, 1929) 1.
[32] "Those Galoshes," *Stentor* (Vol. 34, No. 15, February 13, 1920) 5.

[33] "A Defense of Galoshes," *Stentor* (Vol. 34, No. 17, February 27, 1920) 11.
[34] "Knee Length Sox Get Raspberry on L.F. Campus," *Stentor* (Vol. 54, No. 5, October 21, 1939) 4.
[35] Anonymous, '42:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[36] Helen Horowitz. *Campus Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986) 216.
[37] Schulze, *Thirty Miles North,* 117.
[38] Victoria L. Kolb, 1946, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[39] Anonymous, '47:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[40] Anonymous, '47:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[41] Anonymous, '47:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[42] The names of women listed in the *Lake Forest College World War Two Military Records*, ed. Francis Beidler, II, c. 1948, include: Alice Blacker Slingluff '36, Dorothy Westbay Bradley '41, Marjorie Rump Cooper '43, Ruth Sondel Gerber '44, Betty J. Grimes '42, Kay Bush Hubbell '41, Roberta A. Jackman '45, Helen M. Jensen '28, Mary Longbrake '35, Delphine Louise Loy '40, Dorothy E. Paul, Mrs. Arthur Plunkett '34, Carol Sears '48, Ruth Zink West '32, Elizabeth McArthur Wiiken '38, and Ethel M. Wilson '31.
[43] Beidler, II, ed. *Lake Forest College World War Two Military Records*, 84.
[44] Mary Longbrake, 1935, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[45] Beidler, II, ed. *Lake Forest College World War Two Military Records,* 24.
[46] Phyllis Eaholm Carper, 1948, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[47] Schulze, *Thirty Miles North,* 117.
[48] Anonymous, '47, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[49] Schulze, *Thirty Miles North,* 117.
[50] Phyllis Eaholm Carper, 1948, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[51] Victoria L. Kolb, 1946, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[52] Anonymous, '47:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[53] Phyllis Eaholm Carper, 1948, LFC Women Questionnaire.

CHAPTER TWO

The first half of the period from 1955 through 1965, during Dwight Eisenhower's presidency, was overshadowed by an obsession with fighting Communism and ostracizing anyone who seemed to lead a life that contradicted longstanding societal values. A slightly more liberal era began when President John F. Kennedy assumed office in 1960. The Cold War culminated with the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, which brought with it the frightening possibility of nuclear war, and Kennedy's assassination in 1963 was the final step in shattering people's belief that their traditional way of life was permanent and good. These events caused a dramatic shift in values that enabled changes that occurred later in the decade to unfold. This pattern of change from a conservative to a liberal president and country was echoed locally with a new president and new attitude on the Lake Forest College campus. College president Ernest Johnson's conservative era ended in 1959, and President William Graham Cole assumed office in 1960, marking the beginning of a more liberal era in the College's history.

The postwar mood on campus reflected the times as students sought "normalcy" after the upside-down years of the war but also lived with fear and tension bred by new disorders. "It was the late 50s....We were concerned about nuclear bombs, the Cold War and the Berlin airlift. We were born during the Depression, had fathers and mothers who fought in WWII and friends who had fought in Korea. We were happy to have some normalcy."[1] Patricia Meidros's memories of significant events in U.S. history are vivid, as they were for many other women:

> [With the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962], many of us honestly believed nuclear war was at hand. I felt paralyzed, not knowing what to do or where to go, whether I should try to get home to Massachusetts or stay put. It seemed that everyone shared my terror, and all of us in the dorm

> were glued to the TV for days. It was my first real awareness of international politics, and it was an intense and terrifying lesson.[2]

A year later President John F. Kennedy's assassination had a major impact, as Meideros recalled:

> I remember coming out of bio lab on a dreary November afternoon and hearing church bells. The campus was practically deserted. Then I met someone who told me that the President had been shot. After that, the next few days are a blur of tears and hugs and more tears, and many long hours huddled in groups around the TV, trying to comfort one another. Sharing the sorrow made it both more bearable and more real, more painful. I don't think it's over-dramatizing to say that we realized it was the end of something significant, although it wasn't called "Camelot" until years later.[3]

The paradigm of liberalism that permeated American culture was slower to reach the lives of women but resulted in equally significant changes once it did. The 1950s and early 1960s was an era of traditional family values in which women were shaped to fit into society's molds of the "ideal" daughters, wives, and mothers. "In postwar years, Americans found that viable alternatives to the prevailing family norm were virtually unavailable."[4] Women were trapped in their roles without much chance of breaking free, and were chastised if they chose to be nonconformists. "I graduated in 1955 and was not in on [the women's movement]. My time was still dominated by McCarthy-era values. Dissent...on women's issues...was viewed with suspicion. So was any very great interest in artistic or intellectual matters."[5]

This paper examines the period of 1955 through 1965, a time in which advances such as the advent of the birth control pill in 1960 offered the impetus for women's lifestyles to expand beyond conventional expectations. An alumna of the class of 1965 explained how women's expectations shifted during this era:

> I was at LFC for four years—the first part of the sixties. We all seemed to be looking for change (the pill helped many of us). I wanted my life to be different. I think we felt as if we could do whatever we wanted. We were not programmed to follow in family footsteps. We wanted to do it our way. To skip back—girls in the 50s were concerned about their reputations and expectations were rigid. We broke out of the rigidity and did our own thing.[6]

Women such as Betty Friedan, author of *The Feminine Mystique*, questioned and criticized societal expectations for women. She helped open women's eyes to the limitations of traditional gender roles that were forced upon them. By the late 1960s, "activism replaced adaption as the strategy for changing the conditions of life,"[7] which would not have been possible without the small yet groundbreaking advances made in this period.

The number of rules Lake Forest women were expected to follow in the 1950s and early sixties is overwhelming by today's standards. As a 1956 graduate phrased it: "There were lots and lots and lots of rules."[8] Even as late as 1963 there was a rule that women should postpone marriage until they were done with school, but if they were going to get married they had to inform the school first.[9] The rules were relaxed gradually in the later 1950s, but in 1960-61 the *Student Handbook* still had six pages of rules just for women, in addition to other rules pertaining to both men and women. One rule stated that women were not allowed to smoke, but we know some women smoked in their rooms. "Women were not permitted to smoke outside on campus. You could smoke inside and men could smoke anywhere!"[10]

Most rules pertained to aspects of dorm life. The women had to be in their dorms each evening on weeknights and Sunday by 10:00 p.m. or 10:30 p.m., Friday by midnight, Saturday by 1 a.m. Hours for first year students were even more restricted. Women were required to sign out in a book at the front desk before they went somewhere and sign in again after they had returned and/or after their guests had left the dorm. All women were required to spend time at the front desk of their hall, to make sure women signed in and out, and so on. The school made allowances for those coming directly from

school-sponsored events, but work, including babysitting, was not an excuse for being late for curfew; this limited a woman's ability to earn money.

Any unexcused infraction of these hours was cause for being campused, which meant that a woman was "required to stay in the dormitory, not in the public rooms (lounges, card rooms, rec rooms), sign the 'Campus Book' at 7:30 and 9:00 p.m.,"[11] and she could not speak on the phone. A variety of small rule infractions, such as having a disorderly room, would incur one hour of desk service. In 1962-63 "Penny Night" was instituted on the second Saturday of every month, whereby women were given an extension of one hour beyond 1 a.m, but each had to pay a penny for each minute that she was out past 1:00 a.m. "Penny Night" was no bargain, as rules were complex, covering the need to have proper change, signing out before hand, etc.[12]

Dorm rules for women were generally disliked, partly because they were enforced. A punishment for not returning home for the evening was quite severe, especially considering the reason behind it in the case of one student: "I actually got kicked off campus for three days for spending the night in the Editor's room of the Yearbook."[13] Another graduate recalled: "I resented the restrictions especially the fact that only the girls were restricted.... In the girls' dorms [the rules were] strictly enforced. In the boys' dorms, less so. Boys would sneak girls into their rooms but I never recall them getting caught."[14] While boys may have been able to avoid being caught, in women's dorms if men were in the rooms, cries of "Man on the floor!"[15] would be heard. The absence of privacy had several effects. One was public kissing: "The freshman dorm was unbelievable—at curfew every chair, sofa or wall was covered with necking couples. It was not the sex part of it but the *en mass*, public nature of it."[16] One woman recalled

the last 15 minutes before women had to be in their rooms as "fairly disgusting!...You had to wade through 20 couples necking outside the dorm."[17]

Housemothers resided in each dorm and were responsible for enforcing the rules. "Feelings about housemothers depended on the women in question, basically a personality matter."[18] A "personality matter" might also be a person's campus affiliation. The questionnaires showed that in general very devoted sorority members and/or "dorm mothers" (students whose job it was to act as confidantes, people students could look to for advice) were the most likely to really appreciate and respect the housemother's authority. Those without sorority ties, or the later beatniks, were less likely to feel as positively about them. For example, one woman recalled that "housemothers were very interesting—I don't recall much, except one told me it was unladylike to go in bare feet!"[19] A 1956 graduate gave an amusing picture of housemothers: "One year there was a 'sarong check' of all girls attending a South Seas Party...to be sure girls were properly attired—not too skimpy, etc. One housemother used to blink the entrance lights if a good night kiss took too long!"[20] No one expressed a strong dislike for the housemothers specifically; people just did not feel that they were a necessary aspect of dorm life. One woman, who could be considered rather rebellious, explained how housemothers could vary: "I remember a prejudiced old shrew who had a fit if there was any interracial dating, which actually took place in 1962." She also showed how the general rule about feelings towards housemothers did not always apply: "Mrs. Claus was one of my best friends. She was German, spoke several languages, was over 75, rode a bike through campus, helped me with my French—very international. She did away with public smooching. I adored her. She was my second grandmother."[21]

The campus began to change in the early 1960s in response to a growing student body, which made more buildings and better facilities necessary. The growth that exploded in the 1960s was due to a variety of factors, but mainly the College was interested in changing from a local to a national school, enlarging and improving the faculty, and adding modern buildings to attract students. A greater emphasis was placed on recruiting students from the East Coast, and from foreign countries. President Cole was hired in 1960 to help move the College in its projected direction.

Beginning in 1955 the building of New Dorm, now Deerpath Hall, was planned. It was completed rapidly, opening in 1956, built to house the growing number of women. Other, smaller women's dorms, such as Alice Home, the former hospital, were torn down by the mid-1960s. But the real change came earlier, in 1961, when the trustees approved the building of new co-ed dormitories on South Campus. Although the decision signaled a change in the school's philosophy, it would not begin to have effect until women moved into the dorms in 1963-64. By then the culture of the time was such that it would allow the rules to become more flexible and finally dissolve.

Still, the rules were there and some women chose to defy them. Siri Beckman, class of 1964, explained her creative alternative to abiding by the rules: "My junior year I had a great room in the old hospital building that had a back door of its own. My best friend and I used to use it regularly to go out at night whenever we wanted to." After some time they were finally caught, and spent an entire quarter campused. She explains that she felt badly about disappointing her housemother: "She seemed so shocked that we had broken the rules."[22] At this time, even though women were expressing their dislike of the rules, many still abided by them, and most women were not yet openly defiant. "In

1960 when I started college there were still women's dorms and men's dorms. By 1964 when I was a senior, the college had its first sort of coed dorm with one wing women and the other wing men, connected by a common lobby/public entrance. Each room also had its own entrance. This gave you the illusion of a little more freedom."[23]

The rules were theoretically made and enforced by the Women's Self Governing Association, later the Association of Women Students. One problem with the system was that the women students responsible for campusing their peers were more than likely sympathetic to their feelings, but still had to follow the rules of conduct when giving their punishments. In the *Stentor* this is explained as a common problem, and one man wrote a letter explaining that the system should be abolished, because he believed it was actually the administration puppeteering the women.

Dress codes were in place for both men and women through 1965, with some lasting in weakened form even later. Until then, they remained fairly constant. Everyone had dress requirements for the evening meal on campus. Women were to wear skirts, with blouses or sweaters, or dresses, and bobby socks or knee socks. For the fancier Sunday noon meals, hose, not socks or leotards, had to be worn. The rest of the time: "on campus, during noon meal, in the coffee shop, library, residence halls," and most classes ("but the student is advised to ask first to avoid conflict"), women's dress was casual, meaning slacks and Bermuda shorts were allowed. Men had rules equivalent to the women's. For evening meals they had to wear "clean-collared shirts, clean... sweatershirts, no T-shirts, clean slacks or pressed wash pants, no blue jeans, and [be] clean-shaven," and for Sunday noon meals they had to wear "a dress shirt and tie, no string-type ties, suit or sport jacket with dress slacks."[24] The only inequality in dress for

men and women was that until 1963, women were not allowed to wear slacks in the wintertime. A clause was added to the rules in 1963 saying that "in inclement weather" slacks could be worn to dinner.

The dress rules were slightly revised in 1963 by the student body "to insure a clean neat atmosphere in Commons and at important cultural events." This was in response to the growing Beatnik culture that was beginning to appear on the campus (see page 53ff). For example, the definition of clean was given: "as opposed to dirty or torn,"[25] indicating this was necessary because dirty and torn clothing had appeared on the campus. It would be the last time there was a conservative majority of the College able to triumph in these matters, as hippie counterculture took over the campus in later years.

The strict dress codes were met with protests from some. "Women had to wear nylon stockings to dinner.... One night my roommate and I rolled our stockings to the knee and wore gym shoes. A mild protest."[26] Another woman explained her "crime" and the punishment it received: "Crime: I wore slacks to convocation in sub-zero weather and refused to leave when they asked me to.... When they kicked me off the Yearbook [for this] a protest went up, but it didn't go very far."[27]

There were a variety of other rules. Many theoretically applied to both men and women, but, according to many women, in reality, many were enforced only with women. The alcohol policy represented a striking example of unequal enforcement. Drinking was supposedly not allowed by anyone on the campus, under any circumstances, but women reported that men were often drinking in their dorms. One woman explained that for women "wine at a pizza party in the room was often possible to sneak. No drink was allowed for the boys either but no one noticed if they drank.

Fraternity parties were also supposed to be alcohol free, but the wine and beer flowed down the hall and no one noticed."[28] Another woman noted that while they were used to rules, "breaking the rules was fun..., [but] except for drinking, we were pretty timid about breaking the rules."[29]

Arlene Bitter Anderson, '57, recalled that it "seemed like everyone drank a lot but kept it quiet." She was very upset when "some friends were killed in an alcohol-related auto accident."[30] The campus also kept this quiet, because no obituaries appeared in the *Stentor* for students who were killed in such a way. For a period of two to three years, beginning in late 1956, a variety of articles with statistics and facts about drunk driving were published, along with comics to lighten the mood, but they were never addressed to the campus community specifically. On May 3, 1957, a *Stentor* article noted "the tragic accident early Sunday morning on Skokie highway involving four young people, one a former LFC student, which resulted in at least one fatality," saying that it "bluntly reveals the need to reconsider the problem [of drunk driving]."[31]

Chapel attendance was mandatory for men and women; failure to attend at least four out of the six sessions could result in expulsion. One woman and her male friend were able to graduate without having attended the required number of sessions:

> I was a day student so I didn't care [about school policies regarding behavior]—except for the requirement of chapel, with points, for heavens sake! One if it was a good chapel, two if it was just a religious one, as I recall, and three if it was, for instance, a tuba player's recital. I don't recall how many you had to have to graduate, but Carl Ohlendorf and I didn't have enough, as we made a pact not to go. We graduated, though, because we both had good grades, so they had to give in. Once I had the pleasure of listening to a lecturer who said: 'Are you on Jesus' football team?' I think that was the end for me and Carl.[32]

Practical jokes and disrespect for school grounds were not unusual for this era. They may have had a dandelion pull in 1910[33] to keep the grounds looking nice, but by the late 1950s such community efforts for the school had greatly diminished. In 1958 the

Sunday evening buffet was canceled because students had stolen serving trays with the food on them, along with other items.[34] They also took large amounts of food out of the cafeteria, some of which were "thrown at a window."[35] At the end of the1963-64 school year the entrances to the new Pierson Lounge "were boarded up," due to its perpetually messy condition.[36] The very beginning of the following year some students saw "fit to completely destroy one of the TV lounge tables, tear a coffee shop door off its hinges, deface the round senior table in the coffee shop, and smash a mirror and pull down a shelf in one of the Commons washrooms."[37] These are disturbing, progressively severe signs of how students were losing the innocence of former generations, which were willing to behave and conform.

During this era at Lake Forest College, conformity was a prized attribute, literally. This is evident in the many contests held over the years. Women campaigned to be awarded the title of "most typical" at the annual dance. As evidence that there were special pressures for women at this time to be desirable and considered worthwhile, we can note that even though there was an award for one woman and one man, only descriptions of the women were given:

> Lynn Clifton, a sophomore from Wilmette, co-directed the Alpha Delta Pi-Phipe Varsity Show act. She was on the Homecoming Dance Committee, and is a member of WSGA. Lynn likes golf, skiing, modern dance, and spring vacation in Florida.[38]

Another annual event, Forester Day, featured a contest for Jim and Jane Forester. In 1962, the first time the contest was not limited to Greek organizations, a non-sorority female won. Even so, she had to be affiliated with *something,* so it was her dorm: Carol Mareneck of Annie Durand Cottage.[39] In 1962 the *Stentor* announced it was going to give a Graham Award to a "follower" who had "been extremely amenable to all change that has occurred in the College Community during the past year."[40] The 1960s had not

yet hit the Lake Forest campus, or perhaps it was beginning to, and this was another sign of the changes in students' attitudes.

Spring break trips began to be mentioned in the 1950s. As an April Fool's Day joke, the *Stentor* reported that the 1955 spring break was canceled by the administration, which caused the students to stage a riot. They threw rocks at the Deans (reportedly headed to Bermuda in a helicopter) who imposed a five hundred-dollar fine on those who would disobey, as a fundraiser.[41] Florida was *the* place to go for break. In 1957 the *Stentor* gave recommendations as to what shows to see while in Florida;[42] in 1960 a full-page map of the route from Chicago to Florida was printed under the heading "Florida or Bust!"[43] The Greeks' gossip column covered the events over spring break, making it obvious who went to Florida. Another hint that not everyone participated was an article poking fun at those who would rather study over break, saying they did not fit in,[44] which would make sense if they are not in a fraternity or sorority. In 1960 Siri Beckman gained more than a tan over her break:

> My big sister and I went by bus to Florida that spring during vacation. It was the first time I saw discrimination against people of color. Unknowingly we sat in the back of the bus and soon found ourselves in the black section with everyone looking at us with disapproval. We stuck our ground—the very back seat was big! I returned with a new awareness of what segregation meant.[45]

In 1958 spring break was shortened at the request of students, who wanted to get out of school earlier so that they could find summer jobs.[46]

Women's athletics were not taken seriously through the 1960s. In the 1950s the Women's Athletic Association changed its name to the Women's Recreation Association. More leisure activities, including ping pong, were added to the organization's itinerary. This change reflects lack of serious regard people had for women's athletics and a de-emphasis (if that is possible) of aggressive, competitive sports. A 1955 *Stentor* article on

the sports page satirized the idea of women's athletics by saying that after spring break, all intramural sports would be coed, played by matched male and female teams, with wrestling as the first match. In 1957, the men's track team provided another example of the devaluation of women's roles in athletics. The team elected a queen, who, along with her court, was to preside over their track meet and their job was to "present ribbons to the winners of the various events."[47] Almost all of the women graduates of these years who returned questionnaires noted that sports were not significant during this era.

The situation in the classroom was much better than on the athletic field. Most responses concerning the faculty were positive and most felt that women were treated as equals to men in the classroom. The small size of the student body allowed faculty to get to know women as individuals, which contributed to their generally equal treatment. A 1961 graduate offered amusing snapshots of some professors on campus:

> Some of the faculty were wonderful—concerned, supportive, challenging. Some were okay and not memorable. There was an occasional jerk. There were also some characters—Minerva Pinnell was a kind of wild woman, but I still remember some of her lectures on Renaissance Art. Hutch [Harold Hutchinson], who taught Shakespeare, was so forgetful we had to post a student to watch him—and not let him leave the building until he taught our class.[48]

As Rhoda A. Pierce, class of 1960, noted, the situation at Lake Forest was "very positive. Without the College being attuned to the women's movement, in which I was very active, I could not have worked with admissions and professors to get a flexible schedule."[49]

Relatively few women studied the natural sciences in the 1950s and early 1960s, and the few who did complete a science major had varying views of their respective departments. A student who graduated in 1962 claimed that there was gender discrimination in the sciences: "In physics, women were treated as less than able people. Even though Sputnik pushed the U.S. into science, I was the only woman in physics as a freshman."[50] However, Sue Petzel, class of 1964, was able to compare the College's

faculty to others she encountered said: My recollections of faculty generally were very good to excellent. In my major, chemistry, the faculty was outstanding and [treated] everyone equally. This was an unusual faculty—having gone on for an MA and Ph.D. I have continued to hold this science/chemistry faculty in the highest esteem![51]

Business tended to be a male-dominated major and field. Judith P. Swan, class of 1950, was "a business major—usually the only or one of a few women in class. Men would get me to ask professors to postpone tests, etc."[52] The other extreme is noted by someone with a more traditional women's major: "As an English major, most classes had significantly more women than men. In addition, women professors were in the majority. For these reasons, I don't recall women being treated less well. My main recollection concerns my passivity in those classes as well as the professors' expectation of passivity on the part of all the students."[53]

Some faculty members did take an active interest in seeing the students improve themselves intellectually. In the 1950s there was a group on campus that called itself, quite simply, "The Club." Elizabeth K. Hill explained its background: "The most important [activity I was involved in] was a group formed early in 1953 by a group of faculty. It was invitational, open only to students with high grades,...and [it was] designed to expand students' cultural and intellectual experiences. The Administration forced us to change the name to 'The Student-Faculty Club' and, even though the fraternal organizations on campus were selective, we had to have open membership."[54] Another woman explains the goal was "improving our brains! It was great fun. We'd get good movies—foreign films and the like."[55]

Hill described female faculty and faculty wives as another influence on her at this time: "Many [faculty] lived on campus, and since LFC was small in the '50s, we were acquainted with the wives and children of our professors. These women were certainly role models for me and my friends and quite possibly for other students."[56] Hill consequently went on to become a professor, showing that her experiences in this period may have influenced her career decisions. Margaret Neely Wilhelm also became a professor: "I had wonderful relationships with the faculty and counted them as dear friends. I still see Rosemary Cowler, Ann Bowen, Franz Schulze...and will always treasure my relationships with the faculty and staff. That relationship between staff and students is what makes LFC special."[57]

Most women in the 1955-65 group expected to make marriage and family their career. The idea of a career was not commonplace in the 1950s, or even the early 1960s. Some women hoped to meet their future husband while they were in college. According to a 1963 graduate, the College had a reputation as a place where "dating was much more important than academics. The girls were known to go there for their MRS. Degree."[58] Jean A. Major, class of 1961, summarized the general experience of women during this period: "My main issue was to find a way to occupy myself until I could figure out how to get married. In no sense was I mentally prepared to seek out a career; it had been nonexistent in my education, as well."[59] A few women even married professors. Emily V. Enfinger, class of 1965, recalled that "dating between Professors and students was forbidden. In one case a Professor announced his engagement to a student right after graduation. They had dated in secret."[60] Betty Tschappat, a 1956 graduate, was in the Economics Club, where she "realized how inadequate an economist I was. It also

brought me face to face with a young instructor who became my husband (now of 43 years)."[61] Arlene Bitter Anderson explained that in the 1950s, the only type of sexual harassment that occurred was that "girls harassed professors,"[62] presumably as they searched for husbands.

If women did pursue a career, it was mostly likely to be as a teacher. Two other paths chosen by many were to become a secretary or a nurse. According to Enfinger, these three fields were the only options for women at the annual Career Festival, where "companies came to interview seniors. There were all these companies interviewing the guys for management training programs. There were three lines for women: teaching, nursing, secretarial. I did not really resent this until later."[63] A 1956 graduate said: "Most women got teaching degrees. Many were married right out of college. Not many (few) were career driven. The opportunities weren't there then. To go into a profession or business was an exception. I went the secretarial route.... Women had to make their own way or go for advanced degrees."[64] Even if women wanted to do something different, the odds were against them. Margaret Neely Wilhelm, class of 1958, lived the above explanation: "I struggled against teaching, but finally gave in. I have been teaching for 40 years—half the time on the high school level and half the time on the college level."[65]

As time progressed, options slowly began to open for women. A woman who graduated in 1959 stated: "Careers were limited for women—the choice was teaching, secretary, airline stewardess—I went to the telephone company, and I was the first female college graduate that they had hired."[66] Just two years later, further advances were made: "It was becoming more accepted for women to achieve any goal or occupation they

desired. No longer were women just teachers, secretaries, and nurses. One of my college roommates—Tish Spunar—became a lawyer."[67]

In 1961, the same year Spunar went on to become a lawyer, one-third of the graduating class went on to graduate school, and at least four women received grants for their studies.[68] Jean A. Major, class of 1961 recalled that "there were two to three women English majors who were serious enough students to be thinking about going to graduate school and about choosing an appropriately prestigious graduate school. [There was] no discussion about what they would do with graduate degrees, however."[69] This lack of direction led to the story of one 1961 graduate who, fitting the description Major gave, described herself as "career focused:"

> I knew I wanted to become a professor and viewed the Ph.D. as the Holy Grail. However, I was aware that the road for a woman was bumpy and seldom traveled. I did have role models at LFC, however. I became engaged to a former LFCer in my senior year. He was in grad school at Michigan State, as was my best friend's fiancé. My future husband accepted my plans for grad school and career, but that led to compromises on where I would go to grad school, and later, where I could seek a job. I did an MA at Northwestern, taught a year in high school, then completed a Ph.D. by age 29 while teaching at the U. of Illinois. Then we both sought employment, but he never completed a Ph.D. At that time there were plenty of college job openings, but we had to apply to the very few schools that had job openings in both our fields and which also would allow both of us to be on the tenure track. Most universities had anti-nepotism policies which in effect put a man on the tenure track and forbade his wife to be on it. Stevens Point was the only place we could come as Assistant Professors on an equal basis. We both got tenure and stayed here the rest of our careers although we divorced in 1980, our 12th year here. I held various administrative posts here...but most of my years here have been teaching English.[70]

Another woman who fit Major's description attended Yale University, where she obtained her Ph.D. As a lesbian, she would have had different problems compared to the other woman who compromised her career goals for a husband.[71]

Triumphantly, Emily V. Enfinger, a 1965 graduate, was able to break free from the normal career route. It was, however, a difficult struggle. As a student at the College, she "was Phi Beta Kappa and a history major." As the time came closer to graduation, she recalled: "Many of the males in my classes (almost all with lower grades

than I) were going to law school or graduate school in business management. [Yet] no one suggested that I apply to law school or business management. Those were 'male professions.'" At this time, even she did not consider such a career. Fortunately for Enfinger, she "did luck out, though. RCA trained me to be a Programmer, but I got that on my own, not through any college help." She broke another barrier, because her "salary put her into the top 5% for women's earnings in the country."[72] Although Enfinger's case is exceptional, this is a story that became more and more familiar as time passed and options opened up for women.

A 1961 *Stentor* survey of the class of 1960, compiled by two former *Stentor* editors who were recently married, showed what graduates were doing less than a year after leaving Lake Forest. Out of 47 women graduates, 18 were married and four were engaged. Many of these women had children or were expecting their first. Most of the women fit the stereotypes of women of the era: many were secretaries or teachers, some did not work and instead stayed at home. A few women were leading non-traditional lives. Two women lived abroad: Beatrice McClory was planning on moving to Switzerland with her new husband, who was Swiss, the following year, and Peggy Haines had already eloped to Italy, which she found "quite exciting." Some held non-traditional jobs: Nancy Fullmer was working as a laboratory technician for Dr. J. B. Rhine at Duke University, and Carole Love, who did not graduate from the College, was doing interior decorating in Honolulu. Also, Marilyn Weclew was attending graduate school at DuPaul University, so as to obtain her masters degree in history, and Jean (Beacham) Blake was "residing in Hollywood, California where she is co-starring in a new TV series, 'The Case of the Dangerous Robin.' She also does guest appearances on other shows."[73]

Virtually no one was aware of the women's movement at this time. "The sixties were like the Dark Ages. Our consciousness had not been raised even to question whether we were being treated equally.... I remember reading Simone de Beauvoir's early works (on my own, not because they were assigned), but no one was really talking about these issues."[74] Another woman explains: "I learned about the women's movement in 1959 but really didn't understand. I always hated being a girl."[75] Betty Friedan, an early leader in the women's movement, spoke at the College in 1962-63, although this event is not mentioned in the school publications nor is it recorded on tape. A faculty member and friend of Friedan explained that although there was a "huge attendance, [she] didn't feel any swell of feminism until much later."[76] Her perception is confirmed by the student who recalled: "sophomore year we had Betty Friedan lecture at our dorm (on North Campus). It was the very beginning of the women's movement. She was addressing issues I had not considered before that. It is odd, but most of us, I believe, had accepted the traditional 'women's' roles and did not feel resentment or rebellion. That came later."[77] One of her classmates recalled "being puzzled by her,"[78] in this case because her family had always taught her she was capable of doing anything she wanted, regardless of her sex.

Sexual behavior on campus became more and more open, going through several changes. A woman who graduated at the end of this period, in 1965, observed how women students' behavior was a clear indication that there was a change in attitudes: "[In 1961], freshmen girls were very sexually naïve; the freshmen when I was a senior seemed to flaunt their sexuality."[79] Even in the early 1950s some women were sexually active, but kept their lives very private. A woman who attended the College during the early

part of this period explained there was "lots of necking and petting. Most girls slept only with serious (pinned) boyfriends. If you slept around you didn't talk about it. We spoke as if we were all virgins."[80] One woman described the dating scene at the College in the late fifties and early sixties:

> Most dating centered around sororities and fraternities, but some of us dated "independent"men, meaning non-frat guys. Many women dated older men from off campus; occasionally, freshmen dated sailors from Great Lakes, but that wasn't very prevalent. Fraternities organized pinning ceremonies when they gave their girl their frat pin to signify "going steady" (and sexual rights, I remarked cynically). In the evening the frat guys would serenade the kissing couple; then he'd put his pin on her and give her a bouquet. Most of the girls thought it was soooo sweet. For the most part, I didn't like fraternity members at all although I liked some of them. My boyfriend wrote a paper for sociology about how fraternities were like teenage gangs. I shared his view, having been subjected to the crude remarks of these gaggles of guys fresh from the Lantern and drunk at dinner on Friday. I did not think their panty raids were cute, either, and always locked my door, although many girls encouraged the raiders with their shrieks.[81]

A graduate recalled that on "Sunday morning you'd see used condoms strewn all over the Japanese Garden.... Hypocrisy was on the rampage. Several close friends who went out on 'blind dates' or fixed dates said you needed to know how to protect yourself. The frat guys literally jumped you."[82]

Indeed, some women welcomed attention from fraternity men. In 1958 the Forester of the Week, Marge Tegtmeyer, told the *Stentor* she regarded "being named Kappa Sig Dream Girl as her biggest thrill here at LFC. 'Other than being pinned, that is!'"[83] Perhaps Marge Tegtmeyer followed the guidelines laid out in a *Stentor* article that explained tactics women should use in first "sighting the quarry," then "bringing him closer" and, finally, "landing him." The rules for the first section included buying or borrowing a dog to walk, and recommended finding one to match the woman's hair color. To bring him closer, it was recommended that a woman distribute samples of her baking to eligible bachelors, and to "laugh at his jokes all of the time." To land him, women should "learn to knit or sew, then wear the clothes you've made. But don't mention your

handiwork." A woman should not bring up her past relationships, but should encourage men to discuss theirs. Also, "every now and then, arrange to double-date with a happily married couple."[84] The social values represented, even if tongue in cheek, in these pieces of advice exemplify the ideal woman of the 1950s: a woman who is perfectly domesticated and puts the man's interests ahead of her own. In 1960 the class of 1963 held an all-school carnival. One of the carnival's events was described this way: "Picture yourself as a king with pretty slave girls which you can buy at the carnival." After listing the girls who could be purchased, the article continued by saying "if slave girls are not enough, you can buy kisses from some of the prettiest girls on campus."[85]

The *Stentor* often included articles intended to be humorous that had sexist tones to them. One example is the analysis of a fake chemical with the symbol "wo," meant to represent women, which explained the characteristics of the female gender.

> Accepted Atomic Weight: 120. Physical Properties: Boils at nothing and freezes at anything. Melts when perfectly treated and very bitter if not well-used. Occurrence: Found wherever man exists. Chemical Properties: Possesses a great affinity for gold, silver, platinum and precious stones. Violent reaction if left alone. Able to absorb a great amount of food. Turns green when placed beside a better looking specimen. Uses: Highly ornamental. Useful as a tonic acceleration of low spirits and an equalizer of the distribution of wealth—is probably the most effective income reducing agent known.[86]

Another example was the 1954 *Stentor* chart of the "Lake Forest Co-ed," which displayed a table of the changes that supposedly took place in women who attended the College during their four years, mostly demonstrating a gradual loosening of strict moral codes. For example, from freshman to senior year, a coed "blushes at dirty stories; laughs at dirty jokes; tells dirty stories; [and, finally,] creates them." Similarly, a coed's motto throughout the years changed significantly: "Death Before Dishonor; Mother Knows Best; Nothing Ventured, Nothing Gained; Boys Will Be Boys." According to the chart, a coed "likes to neck" all four years. A coed's expectations of what she hopes to take away

from her college experience dwindle through the years, as it first "leads to things educational, cultural and social," then it "leads to things social and cultural," next it "leads to things social," and lastly it "leads to things." The chart is in accord with the descriptions given of women who attended the College at this time as being generally more interested in their social lives than their education.[87]

Articles like those mentioned above were common, although it seems that people were aware of gender discrepancies. For example a 1959 *Stentor* article, "It All Depends On The Gender," pointed out bias in language: "if he doesn't marry, he's a 'bachelor'—glamorous word. If she doesn't marry, she's an 'old maid.'" It was also noted that "if he keeps his eye on her at a party, he is an 'attentive husband.' If she sticks close to him, she is a 'possessive wife.'" A variety of other contrasts were pointed out, including "head of the house" to "wears the pants in the family," and "quiet type" to "mousy."[88]

Even faculty felt free to speak demeaningly of women. In a 1957 critique of campus manners, Professor Walter Werner Pese spoke of four types of women students he disliked. These included: "personality-minus gals (those who've got that certain nuttin); the grim-faced cuties who give you the impression they bite their dog for breakfast and who think smiling is a sin; their counterparts, the eternal grinners; and, finally, the dowdy types and other wallflowers."[89] Professor Robert Sharvy said in 1956 that one of his pet peeves was "girls who don't flirt."[90]

There was an evolving pattern in the responses to the questionnaire's question: "Were you aware of sexual harassment on the Lake Forest College campus?" Generally speaking, the earlier a woman attended the College the less likely she was to be aware of sexual harassment on the campus. The mid sixties showed mixed responses. A 1956

graduate said: "No (actually, I think there was one date rape case—don't know if it was ever reported) isolated incident."[91] Margie Cohen, a 1959 graduate, replied: "Not really. That was not a term that we were familiar with—if I could go back to that time I probably would be aware of it."[92] A 1960 graduate: "No. This doesn't mean it didn't take place. I just never experienced it at LFC. I have in other settings, but not there. Students and faculty alike seemed to practice an ethic of caring, non-discrimination, and graciousness."[93] Anita S. Woodbury, who graduated in 1962, said: "Not really—the guys would whistle at the gals sometimes but we didn't consider that harassment."[94] Diana A. Stokes, class of 1963, responded: "No. It was not discussed in my day. I think women just either said 'no' or gave in to male pressures."[95] Another 1963 graduate said: "'Panty-raids' were sort of fun! Everything was a new adventure as we had so little freedom.... By today's standards, yes—[but] we didn't know we were being harassed."[96]

There were also women who were aware of sexual harassment, or are now aware that it is the label what they experienced deserved. A 1961 graduate said: "Sure—but we didn't call it that. It was just a fact of life."[97] Another 1961 graduate had a longer explanation of this:

> Yes, there was sexual harassment, but we didn't have the concept. Frat guys in particular made lewd remarks about almost all of us; some women were targeted for sexual fondling, called grabbing then. I don't remember faculty engaging in harassment, but nowadays some of the faculty jokes would be censured. There were frat parties which probably involved date rape or gang rape, but the attitude was that girls who went to a guy's room "were asking for it." Probably there was more talk about it than actual instances.[98]

A woman who graduated in 1963 explained that "lots of girls were harassed on dates—maybe some liked it."[99]

Some women found that their lack of power led them to be sexually harassed. A 1963 African American graduate explained: "I was once harassed by some guy tutoring

me in biology—maybe he wanted it as payment but I preferred flunking biology—but I didn't flunk. The other black girl had problems. Whites thought black women were fair game. She couldn't babysit without being assaulted by the husband on the way home."[100] Some hinted at sexual harassment of women students by faculty. "Some of the faculty were 'more than chummy' with a few female students. I don't think the female faculty was generally as intimately interested in the male students."[101]

The issue of sex discrimination would not be discussed seriously on the Lake Forest College campus until the late 1960s, when nepotism became an issue. Sexual harassment was never mentioned during this period. Serious action concerning sexual harassment did not occur until 1986, when a formal Sexual Harassment Policy was instituted. Instead, especially in the context of changing sex mores and open glorification of sex, the idea of sexual harassment was often satirized, as in "A Touch of Grace." This was an opinion column masquerading in the *Stentor* in 1964-65 as an advice column, with both the questions and answers written by the same person, Grace Sprocket, whose name was a pseudonym.[102] In the fall of 1964 the column published a "letter" about a female student's encounter with one of her professors:

> Addressing me by my first name, the professor asked me to remain after class. Trembling, I stepped anxiously forward; he perused me lustfully and asked me if I had any questions. Not having been born yesterday, I immediately assumed the third karate position, my callused forehand poised threatfully at his throat. Knowing that I had the upper hand, he edged towards the door—as if to block my escape. Once again I waved my hand in an ominous manner, whereupon he fled guiltily from the room. Since then, I have caught him glancing at me stealthily out of the corner of his shifty eyes. And, once in Commons, he dared to brush against me while I was bent over the dollar changer.[103]

Racial and religious discrimination were issues that affected everyone, although many women did not recall any social issues that were relevant at the time. This issue had a large impact on the campus as a whole because of its relation to sororities and

fraternities, where discrimination loomed large. One woman explained how she was affected by sororities' discriminatory policies in the early 1960s:

> I was affected by anti-Semitism, [but] other students were totally oblivious to any social movements....I was not in a sorority as the one I wanted to be in, Chi Omega, had a restrictive clause and could not take Jewish people or African Americans. Sororities were the center of all campus social activities, the source of many of your friends and how you met men.[104]

Arlene Bitter Anderson's story indicated how those excluded by the sorority system organized their own counter-sorority, the Independent Women's Club:

> I was secretary of the Independent Women's Club. I was too poor to join a sorority but Alpha Xi Delta adopted me for a time. As an Independent I saw both sides. Most of the girls in IWC were Jewish or Black—a factor that made me angry at the sorority girls in general—but I got along with all the girls.[105]

Sororities began to soften their discriminatory policies in the early 1960s, but not enough to avoid antagonizing many women. A 1963 African American graduate reported the following story:

> I rushed to see what would happen. I'm a light skinned Negro (very fair). I made it further than the other black girl in my class—but they didn't accept us because of race. Very clear! Independent Women wanted me but I'm not a groupie. I was even rushed by some Black sorority in Evanston. Not interested! I had several very close sorority friends, and some of them fought those policies. By my senior year 1962/63 they were taking Blacks, over the legacy mothers' "dead bodies." All social [life revolved around] the frats, but I didn't care because I basically couldn't get anyone to dance with me, much less a date, because of race. It was as if I was poison to touch. I'm not even sure why I returned my sophomore year. The other girl didn't. We got students from the East second year and they weren't so prejudiced. I had friends, even male ones.[106]

In the late 1950s, Kay S. Severns reported that in her dorm "only five or six residents [were] non-affiliated women, [making] sororities...key to much social activity."[107] Margaret Neely Wilhelm, class of 1958, explained that she "saw resentment by those who did not belong."[108] An academically inclined 1961 graduate who was not accepted into her preferred sorority shared her story and perceptions of sororities:

> I went through rush and wanted to be an Alpha Pi like my mother. However, I was rejected by all the sororities I wanted to join and invited to join one for the rejects, as I perceived them. I was hurt and angry because of the rejection, but also because of the disparity between the real and the stated criteria for joining. They said the criteria for admission were high GPA's and talent in their activities like music and sports, all of which I had. But the real criteria seemed to be who looked

> right and dated the right frat guys (except the rejects' sorority, which contained other hopeless types like me). I later realized that sororities were training grounds for corporate wives and I did not have the requisite social graces nor the interests they shared."[109]

More and more women became "bored and disgusted with the values of the fraternal system."[110] Diana A. Stokes, class of 1963, "did feel negative about the sororities being exclusionary. My roommate was not invited to join any sorority and she was a super person."[111] Denise Stehman, class of 1956, believed the importance placed on sororities was "all very silly. I couldn't take it seriously."[112] Later, the sentiments became even stronger: "Sororities and fraternities were the non-academic life of the campus. I disliked them considerably."[113]

During this period attention was brought to the fact that the national sororities on campus had discriminatory clauses in their constitutions. The women who were not involved in sororities, the same people who were being discriminated against, were, of course, aware of these policies long before this time. When sorority members learned about the discriminatory clauses, members who had been sheltered from such issues in the past had to face what principles their organizations stood on. "When I learned that our Constitution forbade Jews as members, I fussed about resigning; they thought I was crazy!"[114] Betty Tschappat, class of 1956, took a stand against the discriminatory policies: "When I became aware that a negro (1950s for African-American) woman was going through rush and my sorority refused to pledge her—I deactivated—despite a lot of pressure from local and national. Probably insignificant, but my personal campaign."[115] "As a freshman I pledged late to a sorority. I was uncomfortable from the start and 'depledged' before the end of the school year. I was always uncomfortable with the exclusion of Jews. My roommate was Jewish and I liked her better than anyone in the

sorority. I never did see sororities as having a role [on the campus]."[116] Others were not as deeply affected:

> [I was a member of] Alpha Pi.... We pledged a Japanese-American woman. All national sororities pulled their charters. [I was] glad to have the female support my first two years. When the pullout happened, I did not have the time or energy to protest. Devoted time to science courses.[117]

The issue was debated for months. Finally, before the 1961-62 school year began, the administration took a stand by disbanding all national sororities on the campus. There were mixed reactions to this decision:

> I was relieved when most of them were driven off campus because they had discriminatory clauses in their charters. This was something I was unaware of and never imagined that discriminatory clauses existed. I was glad our president and college had taken a stand.[118]

This led the sororities to regroup as local organizations,[119] and to form an Inter-Sorority Council, with a new set of rules and by-laws.[120] In January of 1964, the Chi Omega Chi sorority voted to disband, because the lack of interest in sororities led them to question their purpose. Most of the sophomore pledges from their last rush session had depledged prior to being accepted, because of students' shifting priorities.[121] Emily V. Enfinger recalled that "this social void was taken up to some extent by Dorm groups.[122]

Music was a background to college days and an early sign of cultural change, as students welcomed non-traditional music. It was played at formals and informal parties, people went to concerts or took music classes or lessons. The woman who said "listening to music occupied a lot of my non-class time"[123] probably spoke for many. "The twist was the big dance. After about two hours of 'twisting' continuously I would get a pain in my side. I found that if I ignored it, it would eventually go away."[124] Jazz and blues bands came to Lake Forest College, Dave Bruebeck and Son House among them. At one point, the popularity of blues, jazz and folk music had people considering starting a club to plan outings to see groups or bring them to campus. In the 1960s folk music and rock

n' roll took on a greater importance as they expressed the rebellious views of that era's students. Folk singer Pete Seeger spoke at an all-school convocation in the Durand Art Institute in 1959.[125] A 1961 graduate recalled a Pete Seeger concert she attended off campus: "The biggest commotion I recall was the havoc caused by a Pete Seeger concert in Winnetka. He was, you know, a 'commie sympathizer,' so there was an uproar—and walking through the protesting crowd to the concert was, in fact, a bit scary."[126] A 1965 graduate, active in political issues and from the East Coast described the music scene she was involved in as "lots of listening to guitar music and kids singing."[127] Others preferred rock n' roll: "Rock n' roll made me feel freer....Also, my parents didn't understand it, I liked that a lot. [128]

In 1964, with all of the important social and political issues in the air, the students chose (for a very brief period) to use the methods of protest in the cause of better-quality food for themselves. A spontaneous rally took place in the cafeteria after two practical jokers padlocked students into the cafeteria with a note reading: "Closed for one week due to the abuse of students' digestive systems." After the janitor's hacksaw was stolen, "students harangued each other to revolt, to rise from their seated condition and, for once, *do* something. Soon, a small group of students began a sit-down crusade in the middle of the building, yelling for better food as they reclined and banged on the floor. Becoming hoarse after ten minutes, they quickly dispersed."[129] Such was the sad end to their small protest.

Civil rights issues and awareness, outside of Greek discriminatory policies, were just beginning to be explored in the time between 1955 and 1965. Students Marilyn Lee, Marianne Novak and Linda Wood, "people first and Negroes second," wrote a letter to

the *Stentor* explaining what living on the North Shore was like for them. They described what it was like to go into local restaurants and be denied service, even if they were properly attired and of age: "Your heart sinks, you know you will not get any pizza for a long time." They implored the student body to become conscious about discrimination:

> What we are asking now is not that sit-ins, picketing, or economic boycotts be organized. Rather, we appeal to each of you as individuals to clarify to yourselves what the color of someone's skin means to you: what implications and reactions you feel when you meet a Negro. Hypothesize. Idealize—to yourself, with your friends. And we ask that you become conscious that the situation above has happened to your classmates and will continue to happen, unless...[130]

The number of questionnaires that were returned to me saying that there was no discrimination and no social movements occurred implies their challenge was not met. This 1955 graduate was friends with many African American students, which helped her to understand what these students went through:

> One of my best friends was Glennette Tilley and of course prejudice made me mad. (She's a black.) I remember once not being waited on in a restaurant in Chicago and finally realizing it was because my friend, Peggy Foster, was a 'Negro', so we got up and left in a huff, but that's the only time I was actually obviously affected by race prejudice.[131]

The College's leadership did become more aware of discrimination and even worked to fight it, as the following story, told by an African American woman, demonstrates:

> My junior year, I think, a black guy was elected president of the Freshman Class. He was very capable and charismatic. He went to get a haircut and some Italian barber shaved his head because he didn't want Blacks patronizing his shop. (This in front of the Philosophy Professor.) The student body was up in arms. With the support of President Cole we elected as a College to protest and kicked the barber out of town. It was interesting to see how LFC had changed from when I was an untouchable Freshman to being an outspoken senior leader in racial affairs....LFC did change in those four years. We actively went out and fought racial discrimination in the town and environs.[132]

Emily V. Enfinger recalled her thoughts about the changes she witnessed, which reflect a general shift towards a more tolerant atmosphere:

> There were two African Americans on campus [in 1961-62]—both male. I remember feeling sorry for them because there was no one for them to date. Sophomore year [1962-63] the college made a special effort to enroll blacks. There were 10-20 black freshmen. I remember thinking: "Now there are black girls for them to date." By Christmas they were all dating white students.

> The same black boys who had dated no one freshman year were now dating white girls. Most students were in favor of equality and equal opportunity."[133]

The Tutorial Project was begun in the early 1960s and it continues to this day. Students work as tutors and mentors with elementary aged children in Waukegan and other school districts. A 1965 graduate who was active in a variety of progressive social activities explained: "I did some tutoring for kids from Waukegan—poor, minority students. I must have liked it because I teach special education in a poor elementary school!"[134] This tutorial program influenced the careers of many women graduates from this and the following eras. A few women mentioned how working with underprivileged children shaped what they did with their future. The program's beginning corresponded with a new awareness of political issues, as the *Stentor* showed: "Every afternoon this week, students have gone into areas of unregistered voters in a final attempt to inform them of their voting rights. Under the auspices of the Lake County Democratic Women, and sponsored by the Tutorial Project, these students have gone from door to door with non-partisan pamphlets encouraging people to register."[135]

In March of 1961 a three-day "Walk For Peace" from Great Lakes to Chicago took place, the protesters staying overnight at the College on the first day. This led to an incident that took place on the Lake Forest campus, recalled by a 1963 graduate. "[When the group] came through the Lake Forest Group on World Affairs invited them to sleep at Commons on-campus....Someone organized 'We Want War' pancarts and marched around making a lot of noise. It got in the papers and I was never so ashamed of being a student at Lake Forest."[136] She attributed this act (although she cannot say for sure) to fraternity members. These attitudes did not go away. The next year the Lake Forest College Committee for Peace participated in a worldwide movement, and shortly

afterwards an article by the "Warmongering Committee" was published in the *Stentor*. The authors expressed their perspective: "Why war? Why not? The time has come for our nation to stop pussyfooting around with peace. For a good thirteen years now the United States has cautiously avoided a major war with its inevitable enemy: Communism."[137] Out of confrontations like these all over the country there began to emerge self-styled political conservatives; the general movement was reflected on the Lake Forest College campus, as the majority of students were still conservative.

At the same time, some Lake Forest College students became increasingly radical and increasingly activist. Students participated in protests in Washington, DC. In 1962 fourteen went to the capital to protest to the U.S. and Soviet Union against the "increasing intensity of the race to war."[138] One student, from the East Coast, recalls how she became politically active as a freshman: "I went to Washington, DC, with U. of C. kids to demonstrate against Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear testing. After seeing the thousands of people demonstrating I realized how much of a difference these crowds would make. I was very active demonstrating against HUAC and the Vietnam War."[139] The women from the East Coast who attended in the early 1960s were intelligent and liberal, but did not want to attend single sex schools that existed closer to their homes. This gave Lake Forest a recruiting advantage.[140] These Easterners were the women who seemed to be the most conscious of life outside of Lake Forest, and the most likely to be active in attempting to change situations about which they felt strongly. They often manifested their radicalism by embracing the rebellious forms of dress and other culture.

Apathy came under attack by the *Stentor* in the mid-1960s. In 1964 an amusing editorial addressed the freshman class, sensationalizing its topic and infuriating the administration and other members of the college community:

> It will not be long now before the crisp novelty of a new situation becomes blunted by the sudden realization that we are living in the midst of a rather dull and mediocre environment in which there is little to be gained and even less to do. Soon the entering freshmen will discover the word 'apathy', and they will begin to understand that no word more aptly describes the bland inertia which pervades this place. They will find that most of the people around them are a rather boring lot, and they might begin to entertain the thought of transferring to a place with a better name and a better cultured garden of ivy. For most, however, there will be no escape, and they will know themselves to be stuck. Perhaps the happiest cry that can be heard in such a desert is 'Make mine Bud!' There's really no one around to pull us out of the slosh, we have discovered, and hands stretched out for just a little help before we go under again are nowhere to be found.[141]

In response to the *Stentor* editorial, the College Government Association (CGA), which funded the student newspaper, wrote that it was "taking steps to monitor activities of the editor"[142] responsible for the article. The following week, Grace Sprocket, the opinion editor disguised as a columnist, printed a fake letter that poked fun at the CGA by reporting a discussion between its members and the administration, which the letterwriter "mistook" for a CIA meeting. The columnist responded that she, too, was upset by that meeting and warned: "don't tread on CGA's little toesie-woesies, 'cause they just might vote you out of existence. So watch out!"[143] The administration and CGA's attempt to put a cap on the students' frustration did not work, there was less consensus and so less conformity in the student body.

Change was coming. Dr. Ronald Forgus, psychology professor, commented that the 1961 freshman class had a different air about them in comparison to past classes; they were eager class participants, and wanted to speak with him after class. "'They seem clean and well-fed'...they are more politics-wise with a 'broad rather than a narrow-ivory tower outlook.'"[144] The changes were noticed and reflected upon by students at the time.

Many spoke with reverence for the past. The class of 1963 was instrumental in having stricter dress policies created and enforced, but when they graduated, a *Stentor* editor noted "the last of the old guard—the old Lake Forest College"[145] was gone. On the eve of his graduation in 1964 a student commented that when his class graduated the college would "be losing one of its last remaining links with the past as far as the social system is concerned."[146]

In the early 1960s, more and more people began to disrupt and question the Greek system, along with other aspects of the Lake Forest College culture. The whole oppositional group was labeled "Beatnik." "Back towards the end of my freshman year, around May, 1961, there began to appear a tiny knot of people who were somehow regarded as different. They used to sit in the southeast corner of the Old Commons....It was on this group that the tag "beatnik" came to be hung."[147] Some people were scared of what the Beatniks represented, others hated them, and some were just confused by their lack of desire to join in the social activities of the rest of the students. A woman who dated fraternity members said the Beatniks were "weird" and "considered them undesirable."[148] Another woman described the "20 or so" members of the Beatnik clique "who congregated together in the Commons and on the grass." They stood in stark contrast to others whom she described as "quiet" and "conservative. If anything, we were polite and always spoke to them. They did not respond to any social graces put forward by us."[149] She was not alone in holding these opinions. Many other women who attended at this time wanted everyone to conform and belong to the Lake Forest community as it had existed for many years.

The issue was first joined over the College's dress policy that was highly contested during the early 1960s, and shows how the division between the Greeks and Beatniks grew. A *Stentor* columnist commented on the growth of the Beatnik group:

> By October, 1961, their size had easily doubled, and they had become such a force by 1962 that active resistance began in CGA. Wig Pierson submitted a plan for the enactment of strict dress rules, and suddenly the campus was aflame with controversy. Editorials appeared in the *Stentor* by Pierson for the Pro side and Carol Travis for the Con side, and it was suddenly "the beatniks versus the Greeks." This proved to be an abortive attempt to cover up the beats, for within a year nearly all the dress rules went out the window, even the hallowed Wednesday night formal custom.[150]

The *Stentor* carried an editorial in defense of the majority's time-honored system that was being "continually knocked around by the ever growing movement...[of]...pseudo-intelligentsia" beatniks, who, the editorialist believed, were really conformists. Their conformity was disguised by their different set of standards, but standards nonetheless, for their clothing and behavior; in fact, if they would look in the mirror they would find a "face needing a shave and a fraternity needing a name."[151] In the defense of the beatniks, someone replied that being conformist was not what was at issue. Instead it was "what the group does," explaining that "some of the ideas of the 'weirdos' are serving to perpetuate change." Highlighting the discriminatory policies of the Greek system, the writer gave an example: "Had the 'far-outs' competed in the commendable Inter-Fraternity Sing Saturday night, they too might have sung Negro Spirituals, but at least there would be no question in their minds about [having] a Negro as a member of their group, a situation that is not true of most of LFC's social organizations."[152]

One male student even joked about the faculty, who, generally speaking, were more liberal than the students, showing signs of their sympathy with beatnik ideals. He mentioned the rumor that male professors were growing beards for the Variety Show. He attempted to rally students to strike, saying "strikes and beards seem to go together,"

implying unkempt beatniks typically participated in anti-war strikes. His strong reaction, although sarcastic, echoed what many students at this time believed: "We are fine, clean All-American people and it's time we stand up for those moral standards we believe and love. Our boys did not fight in World War II so that we can let our faculty grow beards....We can't let this happen. Fight the faculty beard craze!"[153] This is evidence of the conservative atmosphere on the campus.

By the mid 1960s the divide between the Beatniks and the Greeks was clear and large. Jacqueline Wallen, who identified herself as a member of the Beatnik group, recalled that it "was a group of alienated easterners who looked down on sororities and were looked down on by them...[Fraternities] hated us. We thought they were dumb." In a larger sense, the Beatniks saw themselves as rebels against the whole community. Wallen said: "I thought the rules were stupid and ran afoul of them many times."[154] They were isolated, by choice, from the mainstream social activities: "We didn't date that much. We just got drunk and/or stoned and hung out together singing/playing folk music....Folk was the center of our social life." Beatniks were involved in many cultural events, and "were active in some civil rights demonstrations in the Chicago area. Vietnam was still a small mess brewing, we were aware of it but large numbers of troops had not yet been sent there."

The 1950s and early 1960s were an era when change occurred slowly and against much resistance, but these years set the stage for what was to come. Then, suddenly, change occurred more rapidly, even drastically. Events such as the Vietnam War, the civil rights movement shook up American society, and the women's movement blossomed, affecting even the relatively isolated Lake Forest College campus. By 1965,

"drugs were widely experimented with, especially marijuana."[155] One 1956 graduate referred to the 1960s as "the time that radicals and feminists began to destroy our country and culture."[156] This was a sentiment echoed more than once by people who graduated in the 1950s, people who grew up in a more conservative time, who were raising children by the time the 1960s arrived. "I know most of my LFC classmates were white, Christian, bigoted, and rich—and are now conservative and Republicans, with a few exceptions. I doubt the 60s were as difficult for them, as most were apolitical and were too old to be drafted."[157]

While no dramatic transformations occurred, small shifts in action or thought began to change the campus. Women began to vocalize their dislike for the many rules women were to obey, and dorm life began to change with the new coed dorms on South Campus. Dress codes were undercut, as women no longer wanted to wear skirts in inclement weather or even dress up for meals, a trend confirmed by the Beatniks. Sororities also changed, obligated to transform themselves from national to local sororities that did not have discriminatory policies. This administrative decision forced the women to examine society and see that discrimination was a part of even the Lake Forest campus. It was a wake-up call to those who would have otherwise been able to remain untouched by such issues.

Women's sexuality shifted during this period as well. The birth control pill was made legal in 1960, but even before this college women were sexually active. It was justified with traditions such as being pinned, signifying women's belonging to one man, making it possible to avoid getting a bad reputation for premarital sex. What was done behind closed doors became more apparent later in the period, as women began to see the

power in their sexuality. Sexual freedom had to be experimented with by women before they could begin to see how to take control of their bodies. Later, some women were further radicalized by double standards in what was deemed appropriate behavior, or limits in sexual independence, such as women's inability to get prescriptions for the pill.

All in all, even as changes began, the period 1955-65 was still one in which women were defined by traditional roles. The popularity of sororities was slowly waning, as women were beginning to see it was not necessary to be a member in order to have an active social life. Fashion was still important for most women, but for some conformity was being thrown out the window as the Beatniks emerged onto the scene. Expectations for women's careers, which had consisted of teaching or some other "job" until children came along, began to expand to include more fields and longer period of work. These were relatively small steps, which helped set the stage for the huge strides that were just ahead.

[1] Margie Cohen, 1959, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[2] Patricia Medeiros, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[3] Patricia Medeiros, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[4] Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*, U.S.A.: Harper Collins, 1988, 14.
[5] Elizabeth K. Hill, 1955, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[6] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[7] May, *Homeward Bound,* 15.
[8] Denise Stehman, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[9] Student Handbook, Lake Forest College, 1963-64, p.????.
[10] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[11] *Student Handbook,* Lake Forest College, 1960-61, 20.
[12] "Penny Night Rules," *Student Handbook*, Lake Forest College, 1962-63, 28.
[13] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[14] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[15] Gerri Batchelor, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[16] Siri Beckman, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[17] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[18] Elizabeth K. Hill, 1955, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[19] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[20] Anonymous, '56:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[21] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[22] Siri Beckman, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[23] Siri Beckman, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[24] "Dress on Campus," New Student Handbook, Lake Forest College, 1964-65, p.8.
[25] *Ibid,* p.8.
[26] Barbara Badger, 1961, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[27] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[28] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[29] Denise Stehman, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[30] Arlene Bitter Anderson, 1957, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[31] R.L.C., "Attitudes, Automobiles, Accidents," *Stentor* (Vol. 71, No. 25, May 3, 1957) 2.
[32] Anonymous, '55: , LFC Women Questionnaire.
[33] "The Dandelion Dig," *Stentor* (Vol. 24, No. 22, April 21, 1910) 249.
[34] Ethel Lobdell, John R. Howard, "Student Behavior Stops Sunday Buffet," *Stentor* (Vol. 72, No. 16, February 7, 1958) 1.
[35] M.G.N., "No More Sunday Buffet!" *Stentor* (Vol. 72, No. 16, February 7, 1958) 2.
[36] I.D.M., "The Barricade," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 22, April 17, 1964) 2.
[37] John Baer, "Vandalism," *Stentor* (Vol. 79, No. 2, October 2, 1964) 3.
[38] "Lettermen's Dance Features Crowing of Most Typicals," *Stentor* (Vol. 71, No. 23, April 5, 1957) 1.
[39] "Jim and Jane," *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 27, May 18, 1962) 3.
[40] "*Stentor* to Give Graham Awards," *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 28, May 25, 1962) 3.
[41] "Administration Cancels Vacation, Students Riot As Faculty Wipes Out Easter Recess," *Stentor* (Vol. 69, No. 23, April 1, 1955).
[42] "It's That Time Again; Vacation Anyone?" *Stentor* (Vol. 71, No. 23, April 5, 1957) 2.
[43] "Florida or Bust!" *Stentor* (Vol. Vol. 74, No.223, April 1, 1960) 4.
[44] "Dean Examines Vacation Possibilities," *Stentor* (Vol. 75, No. 19, March 31, 1961) 2.
[45] Siri Beckman, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[46] "School Out Week Early; Cut Spring Vacation, Summer Job Problem Influences Administration's Quick Decision," *Stentor* (Vol. 72, No. 14, January 10, 1958) 1.
[47] "Queen Bliss and Court," *Stentor* (Vol. 71, No. 26, May 17, 1957) 1.
[48] Anonymous, '61:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[49] Rhoda A. Pierce, 1960, LFC Women Questionnaire. Pierce is now the executive director of the Illinois Arts Council.
[50] Becky Georges, 1962, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[51] Sue Petzel, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[52] Judith P. Swan, 1959, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[53] Jean A. Major, 1961, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[54] Elizabeth K. Hill, 1955, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[55] Anonymous, '55:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[56] Elizabeth K. Hill, 1955, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[57] Margaret Neely Wilhelm, 1958, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[58] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[59] Jean A. Major, 1961, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[60] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[61] Betty Tschappat, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[62] Arlene Bitter Anderson, 1957, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[63] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[64] Anonymous, '56:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[65] Margaret Neely Wilhelm, 1958, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[66] Margie Cohen, 1959, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[67] Priscilla Rush Chalmers, 1961, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[68] "Allhands, Hommes, Lyson Receive Financial Aid For Graduate Work," *Stentor* (Vol. 75, May 26, 1961) 3.
[69] Jean A. Major, 1961, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[70] Anonymous, '61:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[71] Anonymous, '61:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[72] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[73] Jim and Mary Rutherford Garland, "Roundup of Class of '60 As Made By Alumni Office," *Stentor* (Vol. 75, Jan 6, 1961) 2.
[74] Siri Beckman, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[75] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[76] Anonymous, F:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[77] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[78] Dorothy Eleesin-Janus, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[79] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[80] Denise Stehman, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[81] Anonymous, '61:2 , LFC Women Questionnaire.
[82] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[83] Patt McGill, "Forester of the Week," *Stentor* (Vol. 28, No. 3, October 3, 1958) 6.
[84] "Girls! Learn Tricks of Love: How to Attract Bachelors," *Stentor* (Vol 74, No. 1, September 18, 1959) 2.
[85] "Slaves, Gambling, Kissing To Feature Freshman Fair," *Stentor* (Vol. 74, No. 24, April 8, 1960) 1.
[86] "The Chemical Analysis of a Woman," *Stentor* (Vol. 69, No. 2, October 1, 1954) 2.
[87] "Lake Forest Co-ed," *Stentor* (Vol. 69, No. 12, December 17, 1954) 2.
[88] "It All Depends on the Gender," *Stentor* (Vol. 74, No. 9, November 13, 1959) 5.
[89] Walter Werner Pese, "Pese Protests Manners of Campus Coeds and Clods," *Stentor* (Vol. 71, No. 21, March 22, 1957) 2.
[90] Dr. R. Sharvy, "The Faculty Corner: Professor Picks Personal Peeves," *Stentor* (Vol. 71, No. 5, October 26, 1956) 5.
[91] Anonymous, '56:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[92] Margie Cohen, 1959, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[93] Anonymous, '60:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[94] Anita S. Woodbury, 1962, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[95] Diana A. Stokes, 1963, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[96] Anonymous, '63:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[97] Anonymous, '61:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[98] Anonymous, '61:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[99] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[100] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[101] Anonymous, '60:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[102] Grace Sprocket is not listed as a student with the registrar's office, nor is she in the alumni directory.
[103] Grace Sprocket, "A Touch of Grace," *Stentor* (Vol. 79, No. 2, October 2, 1964) 5.
[104] Anonymous, '63:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[105] Arlene Bitter Anderson, 1957, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[106] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[107] Kay S. Severns, 1959, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[108] Margaret Neely Wilhelm, 1958, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[109] Anonymous, '61:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[110] Elizabeth K. Hill, 1955, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[111] Diana A. Stokes, 1963, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[112] Denise Stehman, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[113] Anonymous, '61:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[114] Anonymous, '56:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[115] Betty Tschappat, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[116] Barbara Badger, 1961, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[117] Ann Marie Norberg, 1963, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[118] Siri Beckman, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[119] "Sororities Pick New Greek Names," *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 6, November 3, 1961) 1.
[120] "Sororities Form Council," *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 6, November 3, 1961) 1.
[121] "Chi O's Vote to Disband, Believe That Sorority Has Lost Importance on Campus," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 10, January 10, 1964) 1.
[122] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[123] Anonymous, '63:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[124] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[125] "Folk Singer, Peter Segur At LFC, For Convocation," *Stentor* (Vol. 72, No. 3, October 4, 1957) 1.
[126] Anonymous, '61:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[127] Jacqueline Wallen, 1963, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[128] Anonymous, '63:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[129] "Chains of Freedom," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 23, April 24, 1964) 2.
[130] Marilyn Lee, Marianne Novak, Linda Wood, "Guest Editorial...," *Stentor* (Vol. 75, No. 4, October 14, 1960) 2.
[131] Anonymous, '55:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[132] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[133] Emily V. Enfinger, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[134] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[135] "Students Canvass Lake County to Register Voters," *Stentor* (Vol. 79, No. 2, October 2, 1964) 5.
[136] Anonymous, '63:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[137] Dick Alcorn, Toby Collins "Warmongering Committee Presents Its Position," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 14, Feb. 2, 1962) 2.
[138] Butch Marshall, "The Growing Peace Movement Becomes a Political Actuality," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 16, February 16, 1962) 3.
[139] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[140] Interview with Arthur Miller, Lake Forest College Archivist, April 2000.
[141] "Normalcy" Stentor (Vol. 79, No. 1 September 25, 1964) 2.
[142] "CGA Takes Steps to Monitor Activities of *Stentor* Editor," *Stentor* (Vol. 79, No. 2, October 2, 1964) 1.
[143] Grace Sprocket, "A Touch of Grace," *Stentor* (Vol. 79, No. 3, October 9, 1964) 5.
[144] "Impressions of Freshman Class; Only One Flaw Among Their Virtues" *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 3, October 13, 1961) 2.
[145] C.G., "Reappraisal of Dress Code," Stentor (Vol. 78, No. 7, November 6, 1963) 2.
[146] John McDonough, "Breezy Contemplating the Bust of KKX," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 28, May 29, 1964) 2-3.
[147] John McDonough, "Breezy Contemplating the Bust of KKX" *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 28, May 29, 1964) 2-3.
[148] Emily V. Enfinger, 1964, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[149] Anonymous, '64:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[150] John McDonough, "Breezy Contemplating the Bust of KKX" *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 28, May 29, 1964) 2-3.
[151] Don Williams, "Beta Eta Alpha Tau" *Stentor*, (Vol. 76, No. 24, April 20, 1962) 1.
[152] Michael Gaylord James, "Caught by the Beard," *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 24, April 24, 1962) 1.
[153] Mack Weisheit, "Faculty Beards? Strike Proposed," *Stentor* (Vol. 76, No. 16, Feb 16, 1962) 6.
[154] Wallen, Jacqueline, 1965, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[155] Anonymous, '65:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[156] Joyce Mathis, 1956, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[157] Anonymous, '56:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.

CHAPTER THREE

The ten years from 1965 through 1975 was a period in American history characterized by vast social and political changes. Escalation of fighting in Vietnam led to increased protests against the war after 1965. The Democratic presidential campaign in 1968, culminating in violence in the streets of Chicago during the nominating convention, also increased protests against the government. For women, the 1968 protest at the Miss America pageant in Atlantic City demonstrated the rising power of the feminist movement. That same year students nationwide were frightened and angered by the murders at Kent State and the protests that followed.

In the past, and in years that would follow, the Lake Forest College campus was sheltered from the outside world and current issues. But the events of this period were so large, questioning and shaking the country's foundations to the core, that even the Lake Forest campus was affected, making it a unique period at the College. The stories women tell from the period 1965-75 are mostly ones of general transformations of campus life and also of greater involvement in the larger political life of the nation. The main themes that tied the College to larger national events were the opposition to the Vietnam War, civil rights and women's liberation, all of which combined in the rejection of the traditions or authorities of the past. Many of the campus rules and practices that had discriminated against women were either eliminated or ignored. The result was that women's experiences seemed to be more like men's. The real divide was between those who wanted rapid change and comprehensive challenge to authorities and those who resisted such a radical approach.

The changing attitudes of this era drastically altered how women viewed themselves and their roles in society. Women began to be aware of discriminatory practices that made their place in the United States secondary to that of men. This chapter focuses on changes that occurred during this ten-year period at Lake Forest College, between 1965-1975, that are relevant to the women's changing role in society. This role was shaped by women's changing perceptions and expectations of themselves and of the world at large. There are countless small examples of the large changes that occurred for women during the period of 1965 through 1975, which were apparent in most aspects of women's lives. Clothing rules or trends are one example: "As a freshman, women were required to wear skirts to class. The length of the skirt needed to be at the knee or lower. By my second year pants were in and jeans were fast becoming acceptable in classrooms."[1] Curfews are another example: "I attended LFC in the transitional era of curfews and [went from] stringent rules freshman year to an open door policy with no curfew by my senior year."[2]

Women who responded to the questionnaire mixed their reports about changes in women's situations with reports about broader changes at the College. In no other time than the late 1960s and early 1970s could you have heard: "There was no football team at that time, which was a source of pride for a lot of us."[3] Others explained: "It was a rebellious time with some students flaunting their sexuality and drug use."[4] "The sixties allowed me to see people of all races working together to end racism and sexism. These were fine ideals."[5] Donna Campbell, class of 1972, gave her impression: "College was strange at that time. Professors were 'anti' many things.... We got pass/fail/honors [instead of letter grades]. Very few people would be business majors. [In fact, there was

no business major.] Sororities and fraternities were 'out.' Anything traditional was not done. Drugs were big.... Dogs would wander in and out of the Commons cafeteria. People wore baggy frayed jeans and old tee-shirts."[6] Campbell and other women gave a picture of the campus that point to the College's continuing sense of privilege, even in a relatively radical period. "I felt the campus was very rich, very isolated and very involved with drugs. Outside of [the social issue concerning] black power, the world scarcely existed."[7] "Someone called us apathetic radicals. That fits nicely."[8] English Professor Rosemary E. Cowler remarked that "there was an innocence in their protest movement."[9]

Stories about "happenings" exemplify the 1965-75 period in action. "Humor and creativity were encouraged. Spontaneity was prized. One day, walking across campus, I heard over the loudspeaker: 'The drugged-out, nude hippie love-in will begin at noon.' Of course there was no love-in; this was just a joke to outrage stuffy visitors. We loved 'guerrilla theater'—odd, freak-out-other-people actions."[10] Another example of this creative outlet is a "happening" in Hixon Hall, which was said to be viewed by people who were either "flipped out" or "slightly nauseated":

> Those who were just visiting were directed around the back of Hixon (by something resembling the cross between a circus clown and a hippie) through an open window, climbing on chairs, stools and tables in order to get on the inside. Then you crawled along a long, low, narrow passageway constructed of bed sheets (if you were lucky, you were fed on the way) that led to where "they" were. One of the "in people" was wandering around frantically looking for his glasses (I assumed they were buried under the kernals of popcorn that were being thrown from above like manna from heaven), trying to read without them. Another, half naked, was jitterbugging around imitating a fish and dragging oil-covered girls onto the floor (by this time also covered with about an inch of Mazola). And there above it all, sitting on a fifteen-foot throne in the middle of the spectacle, was the master of ceremonies, himself, Rob Pulleyn, showing slides and motion pictures in four different places at once, surveying with obvious pride that which he had so masterfully created. We thank you, Mr. Pulleyn, for bringing a little happiness to LFC.[11]

This story demonstrates five key elements of this era: drugs, women, spontaneity, confusion, and fun.

The atmosphere of the College was occasionally likened to that of a zoo, in two ways. First, for a while pets were allowed on campus. In 1970 this privilege was taken away, as a result of the inadequate conditions in small sized dorm rooms and students' poor care of their pets, specifically cats. A maid "nearly passed out" when she discovered a five-foot boa constrictor in someone's room.[12] One woman recalled this, saying: "We had only one rule: Thou shalt not hassle thy neighbor. Any degree of eccentricity was permissible as long as it didn't upset anyone else unduly. Only a few things did, as I recall: the boa constrictor and 102 white mice one student kept were grounds for a roommate change, for example."[13]

Zoo-like terminology was used to describe student behavior on the campus, especially in three key locations: the library, the cafeteria and South Campus. Sue Wood wrote a letter to the *Stentor*, complaining about the "intellectuals' zoo,"[14] or the library, which was used more for socializing than studying. The cafeteria was a place for "lovebirds" and "kissing fish" one "grossed out" student remarked.[15] Complaining about the cafeteria, Jody Broeckl recommended some protective equipment: "umbrella..., a suit of armor and ear plugs."[16] On April Fool's Day in 1973, on "behalf of journalistic honesty," the *Stentor* published a manipulated photo of South Campus, populated with animals such as zebras, elephants, and a giraffe, proving that President Hotchkiss's claim that the campus was a zoo was true.[17] A 1974 article describing South Campus as a zoo explained that it was a place with "guys on a never-ending quest for girls, and everyone wasted." "Between drags on a pipe," one female student explained: "I really enjoy these Saturday nights over here. It's nice to get high, and have some drinks."[18] Considering the four fraternity bars on South Campus, along with false fire alarms and vandalism, it

appeared as though Hotchkiss's comment was very much on target. As one woman recalled about fraternities on South Campus, "When we heard about their party aftermath—e.g., lighting a couch on fire and throwing it off the balcony into the quad—we felt sorry for them for being so stupid."[19]

The Beatniks of the previous era evolved into hippies in the mid-sixties. "The hippie movement changed the social scene. It was in for the majority of students to dress hip to some degree. Some basically only wore bell bottoms and others really looked like freaks."[20] It was not just the beatniks, either: "Everyone went from being a preppy to being a hippie."[21] Before, "there [had been] clear social groups: teeny boppers, preppies, jocks, unconventionals (later to become hippies), and nerds. These groups were more clearly demarcated freshman year. When there became more of a hippie scene, the lines blurred."[22] To remain removed from the hippie scene had social consequences: "If you were not joining into these activities, you were considered a 'nerd.'"[23]

Many hippies looked beyond their personal situation and developed into political radicals. These students were a new breed: "unschooled in and impatient with radical doctrine, intensely moralistic, suspicious of 'elitism' and 'bureaucracy,' and immersed in what was just starting to be referred to as the 'counterculture' of casual drug use, sexual experimentation, and rock music."[24] Some were involved with Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). A chapter of the left-wing organization was founded at the College in 1966.[25] SDS's main activity was protesting the Vietnam War.

National news events were often witnessed and/or supported by Lake Forest students. The Chicago National Democratic Convention of 1968 and the following Chicago Conspiracy Trial were related events attended by Lake Forest College students

and faculty. Co-organizer and defendant Jerry Rubin[26] and attorney William Kunstler even spoke at the College. Sheila Nielsen, class of 1971, reported that attending the trial helped influence her decision to become an assistant U.S. attorney, and she even appeared in court before Judge Julius Hoffman, who tried the famous case.[27]

Reaction to the violence at Kent State in May 1970 "virtually shut down everything on campus."[28] "Right after the...incident, I remember walking around all night with a friend pondering whether or not to attend classes the next day,"[29] reported class of 1973 member Judith A. Gates. She did not attend classes, nor did anyone else, because the faculty voted to suspend classes for two days in support of the student protest.[30] The protest consisted of four to five hundred students and some faculty marching to Fort Sheridan and blockading its entrance and Sheridan Road.[31]

A left-wing organization called the Nerve Center was formed on campus, within two weeks of the Kent State incident. The intent was "to inform students of local and national strike activity...[and to] act as an information bureau to keep track of campus events and to organize and coordinate the various groups."[32] It was formed by three men and one woman. Their responsibilities grew until they were in charge of keeping various political groups in the Midwest connected and aware of what was happening on campuses in the area "in the event of another nationwide campus crisis" like the one that ensued after Kent State. They worked "in conjunction with the University of California at Berkeley, Whittier College in California, and Amherst College in Massachusetts."[33] The effectiveness of the group was questioned by the *Stentor*, when, on a day of national protests, including one in Chicago, Nerve Center was closed, showing that "once again, we're only pretending."[34] But a year and a half later the Nerve Center was nominated for

and received a citation from the National Center for Voluntary Action for its achievement, because, as its advisor stated, "Nerve is one of the few remaining constructive groups on campus that hasn't faded out with apathy."[35] One thing that kept Nerve Center going was that it began to go beyond giving people political information. It helped to coordinate the activities of the Birth Control, Abortion, and VD Information Committee. (In later references abortion was removed from the title.)[36] This educational group began to be active in 1970-71. They distributed pamphlets "on birth control and abortion to students" in the dorms.[37]

The Pierson Rooms was where the group of left wing, intellectual students spent their time, as many women recalled. "The 'beatnik' corner of commons became the 'hippie' corner while I was there."[38] "My smart buddies hung out in what was then Pierson Lounge. There weren't many of us who crossed the lines between 'prep' and 'beat'—it was a good way to meet people."[39] "My entire social group, the 'Pierson Lounge' group, was anti-war, pro civil rights, pro SDS, and concerned with poverty and social justice. These were the values that held us together as a very loose-knit group."[40]

The description of the hippie scene would not be complete without touching on drugs, especially marijuana. On the Lake Forest College campus, drugs began to be a big issue in the later 1960s and early 1970s. From the point of view of the faculty and administration drugs were a problem. In the late sixties, in an attempt to deter people from doing drugs, the punishment was made more severe for those who were caught with marijuana.[41] A freshman poll early in 1970 indicated that over two-thirds of the students favored the legalization of marijuana.[42] By the fall of 1970, the administration took a step to combat drug use, writing a letter to students arguing that drugs had become a problem

on the campus. They gave a number of reasons, citing the "sale and distribution of drugs, excess usage by some students, the college's reputation as a drug center, and combinations of the former which have introduced the spectre of violence."[43] By the 1970s drugs became more of an escape and a more constant problem than an occasional incident, as students began to be less hopeful, less interested in the world, and more cynical, and the campus turned in on itself again. Many women who graduated in the 1970s reported that "drugs (recreational) were prevalent, use was high."[44] "I think teachers were pleased when kids came to class and weren't stoned."[45] As a 1973 graduate noted, "The legalization of marijuana was probably a 'hidden' issue for quite a few people."[46]

Some students tried to live their politics by creating cooperative organizations. A number of co-ops were either in existence or being discussed in 1970. There was a "student Co-op Store, located at the former Szabo snack bar in Commons,"[47] that sold items such as notebooks, pens, etc. The idea reached the dorms in 1971-72 with "co-ed and co-operative innovations in Deerpath."[48] In 1974, however, Deerpath Hall's co-op kitchen was inspected by the Lake County Board of Health, prompted by the College's nurse's inspection of the co-op's kitchen, which she called "unsanitary."[49] The most interesting version of the cooperative impulse was the discussion of a co-op organized by the Lake Forest College Farm Cooperative to live in Wisconsin on a working farm. The group's objective was to "obtain a balance between academics, working with one's hands, and the ecological benefits of working on a farm," and their method would be to "undertake subsistence farming and production of craft items." The intention was for the co-op to be a full part of the College. The fee, the same as for living in the dorms for the

year, was meant to cover all of their needs.[50] They were able to get 13 people to agree to live on the farm, but they needed 20 to make it financially feasible. The other problem they encountered was "obtaining permission for participants to live off-campus." The dean said he did not want to give them priority over other students.[51]

The civil rights movement and racial issues had the most impact on student to student and student to faculty or administration relationships in this period. There was an increase in civil rights activities on campus. The tutoring program grew even stronger in this period. One woman explained how the group was inspired by the African American students on the campus:

> We had a few Black students from the south who were personally involved in school desegregation and voter registration, and the college as a whole seemed to take up the cause. We marched, we listened to speakers both on campus and in Chicago, and we raised money. Some students went south during the summer to help with voter registration. One offshoot of this movement was an interest in Blacks in our own backyard, and a tutoring program was started with an elementary school in the area. I participated in this program, working on reading with a couple of children.[52]

Participation in the program led many women into social service and education: "I tutored children in Waukegan and was a silent observer of [local] demonstrations. The effects: presently I am on a school board and advocate changing and improving our educational system."[53] Another woman explained: "I was involved in a Saturday tutoring program in a project in south Chicago. That was meaningful and helped influence later career choices."[54]

In 1967 a group of African-American women students objected to one of the policies of the Office of Admissions. Before placing female freshman Caucasian and African-American students in the same rooms, Admissions would call the Caucasian student to find out if she would mind living with the African-American student. Only one African-American student reported receiving a phone call asking what she would

think about living with a student of another race. Admissions argued that African-American students should just expect to be placed with a student of another race, since they are going to an integrated college. A *Stentor* article made the point that Caucasian students should go to the school with the same understanding. The solution to this was to ask the question "Would you object to a roommate of another race? Comments (if any)." The *Stentor* article argued that none of this should be necessary, the question should not even be asked.[55]

Soul Week was organized in 1968.[56] "Its stated purpose was to focus on the Afro-American influence in the fine arts, and in a larger sense, to awaken, perhaps by confrontation, a new perception of what it means to be Black."[57] After the week was over, the chairman explained that Soul Week had "succeeded in eliminating much of that apathy which is so prevalent on campus. Be it good or bad, people are thinking."[58] The students pushed for a proportional number of African-American professors to be hired in relation to the number of African or African-American students, and both faculty and administration came to support the principle.

"Race on campus was a big issue. It was for me. But by the 1967 year, there was very little mixing."[59] The atmosphere of the college changed drastically after the murder of Martin Luther King, which symbolized the "shattering of his fragile and quite radical dream of a nonviolent, integrated society."[60] King's death had a large impact on the African-American community at the College because of what his cause and his death symbolized. As John Moffet put it in a letter to the *Stentor* in April 1968:

> While I might not have agreed with every single word that Martin Luther King said, I do, nonetheless, a have the sense to realize that he devoted his life to improving his people—my people. For this alone, I would mourn his death.... I am grieved by the death of Martin Luther King because he was a black man—and a black man murdered by a sick white society.[61]

However, King's methods were not the ones that most interested students at the College. As an African-American woman remembered: "Many black females were very interested in the philosophy of the Black Panther party and activities of the black student union. Malcolm X was a toted hero. Martin Luther King, nonviolence, peace marches were viewed as Uncle Tomism and ridiculed."[62] The *Stentor* took note of the King assassination in the issue of April 12, 1968, which carried a number of letters and articles (all written by men) expressing anger at how the college community and nation dealt with his death. One letter defended the reaction of African American students after King's death:

> It has been mentioned that whites do not totally understand the recent cohesiveness and the mourning of the black students on this campus. It has been asked that since so many people considered Martin Luther King, Jr. an "Uncle Tom." I think that it is not your business to understand and that one of your problems is that you have "tried to understand Negroes."[63]

Another letter was illustrated with a photograph of women sunbathing on the day classes were called off to memorialize King's death; the caption "Honkie Holiday," said other students used the day for "fire works, drinking, and softball games." This letter ended with these words: "WHITEY, I DON'T KNOW WHAT'S ON YOUR MIND, BUT I WON'T BE SURPRISED IF THE NEXT THING IS A BULLET FROM A BLACK GUN."[64]

King's murder led African Americans to form a cohesive bond, and create an exclusive organization that would develop racial identity and power. "We formed Black Students for Black Action [BSBA] and began to withdraw from some of the inter-racial affiliations developed in our freshman year....Integration was no longer a priority, although I was always uncomfortable with abusive hate-filled remarks or actions toward anyone of any ethnic heritage."[65] BSBA claimed almost all of the 90 African-American

students as members in 1968-69,[66] tending to absorb activities of all African American students. Tensions rose; at least twice fights between black and white males were reported in the *Stentor* news.

With the rejection of integration, friendships were broken. A Caucasian student recalled that "the Black Power movement had the greatest impact [on the campus] and at least initially, it rather polarized the blacks and whites into separate groups, which was uncomfortable yet understandable to me. I missed the company of my black friends."[67] At one point African-American students wanted their own student government organization. Even after overt anger died down, African American students maintained that "we're too busy with our own problems now to concern ourselves with any sort of integrative experience."[68] African American students even started their own newspaper, *Black Rap*, in the late 1960s.

African-American students encouraged the administration to bring a diverse group of speakers to the campus. "My second or third year there I worked at Black Panther party headquarters briefly. (While it was fashionable to allow civil rights leaders and groups on campus.)"[69] Jesse Jackson, "barefoot and wearing bib overalls,"[70] spoke in 1967 on the topic of "Operation Breadbasket: A Redefinition of Man."[71] Bobby Rush, minister of defense of the Illinois's Black Panther party, spoke in Reid Auditorium in 1970: "Rush obviously did not find the revolutionary element he was looking for here (he termed the college an 'ivory tower of ignorance'). When the 90 [people] present were asked who among them would join the Panthers in their struggle, fewer than ten raised their hands."[72] In 1969 "Blackout" was formed. It was African-American theater troupe whose first two plays were directed by sophomore Carolyn Jackson.[73]

In 1970, Pam Dooley, an African-American woman, caused a stir on the campus by charging racial bias in the classroom. She claimed that English Professor Kenneth Bennett told her she was going to fail, and she believed that the sole reason was due to her race. She also believed that she passed only so that Bennett could avoid confrontation of the issue.[74] She filed a complaint in the spring of 1970, but the issue did not become well known until the following fall, when it was published in the *Black Rap*. After months had passed, it became difficult, according to President Hotchkiss, to find any proper evidence to proceed, thus closing the case.[75]

The civil rights movement affected African-American women differently from the men, because they had to deal with their struggle for rights as women as well. One faculty member recalled: "A group of African-American women students asked to meet with me to discuss the problems they were encountering in the Black students' organization in which they were expected to fill lower leadership roles than the males, despite the excellence of many women students. Loyalty to race and to feminism were in conflict."[76] Cheryl D. Phillips, an African-American student, noted that "women's issues took a backseat or were not even discussed or considered major for us." She also explained that "in response to news of Martin Luther King's death, I cut my hair into an 'Afro' to identify with my people and the civil rights movement."[77] This was a trend among African-American women at this time; a *Stentor* letter from an African-American female student praises her sisters for embracing their black beauty. Women's involvement, and secondary roles in, the civil rights and anti-war movements are what eventually led women to recognize the dire need for their own movement.

The hippies and civil rights activists were not the only groups on the campus at this time, although their activities received the most press. There was another group of more conservative students, which some women recalled as usually consisting of people belonging to or being affiliated with fraternities and perhaps being labeled "preppy." In 1966 a group of students wished to form a branch of the Young Americans for Freedom organization. At first the request was denied, until "a point regarding membership status of non-United States citizens is clarified with the national parent organization."[78] The YAF was formed in response to the formation of an SDS chapter on the campus, to "provide some political balance." They felt too many liberal organizations were on the campus at the time, and there needed to be an option for conservative students as well.[79] As a 1967 graduate explained: "Cold war ideology seemed to fill the school."[80] Conservative students were in the minority, as a 1966 poll declared, the "campus tends to be liberal politically."[81] Conservative students were able to hold out until 1970, when the Young Republicans group "faded away," no longer able to "stem the tide of rising liberalism at Lake Forest."[82] It appears that the YAF group also faded away.

A letter to the Stentor claimed that another conservative group on campus, White Students for White Action (WSWA), had been formed in reaction to BSBA, a response to BSBA's "walk-in" during a dinner on parents' weekend. The letter claimed that WSWA's members never revealed themselves "lest we find ourselves answered with violence." The letter explained WSWA would only react to what BSBA did, and were intent on preventing "any student on this campus from dominating any other student."[83] The group's formation "came as a surprise to the administration, and BSBA as well."[84] WSWA's letter stated that "we shall only recruit in silence, meet in silence, and move

openly on paper,"[85] but there were no other letters or known actions from the group. WSWA was taken to task by a Caucasian student, who wrote a letter to the *Stentor:*

> WSWA is an ugly spot which has appeared. It is ugly because it is negative in its purpose, and it is ignorant of what Blacks are doing on this campus, or in this country, or even what they are faced with at the hands of our white society.... I will admit that I feel that some of the action taken by Blacks on this campus have made me angry. Some of the aspects of Black Nationalism in this country are disturbing, but what is more disturbing and angering is the lack of understanding displayed by whites, concerning what is happening in the country.... I advise that WSWA disband, go home, cool off and think.[86]

Professor Donald Bartlett of the Religion Department theorized that "I can only conclude that the cry for equality, the desire to 'mimic,' is a device for resisting real equality."[87]

In the dormitories, even though the system of rules and housemothers persisted, new attitudes beginning to appear. Rules were often ignored, instead of being followed by the majority, as used to be the case. In 1968-69, said one woman, "there were rules and housemothers, but we regularly evaded them. My [future] husband once hid in the closet when the housemother staged an inspection. I think she must have known he was there (his size 13 shoes were in plain view), but she took pity on me."[88] The story shows that housemothers still had the right to go into the women's rooms any time they wanted—women had no privacy—but it also shows that even the disciplinarians were changing with the times. Women who were at the College after 1965 reported quite often that they broke the rules. "The rules around the dorms were very strict, and we evaded them as much as possible. We brought men into the dorms through windows on the first floor, and let our late friends in when the dorm was locked."[89] Another explained: "If we could figure out how to break a rule without getting caught, we did. I mean, what are fire escapes for?"[90]

Women were still subject to a separate governance system, the Women's Government Association, later the Association of Women Students. "The whole idea of a

separate women's government association was just beginning to be questioned [in 1965]," explained Patricia Medeiros, "In fact, I ran for president of WGA [i.e., AWS] on a platform that proposed abolishing it; I think I got five votes. That was too radical a proposition for 1965, but the rules did loosen up a bit during my stay at LFC."[91]

However, the immediate reaction to the evasion of the rules was to create new ones. In 1966 the Association of Women Students approved a rule that said if students were more than half an hour late without calling their housemother, the woman's parents would be notified.[92] A year later the *Stentor* told the story of two women who ran afoul of the new rule when they won tickets to the opera in a college raffle. They were unable to locate their housemother before leaving for Chicago, so they had a friend explain their situation and ask for an extension on their hours.

> Upon their return the girls discovered, because they had failed to call their housemother from the opera during intermission, that they had broken dormitory rules. At 1 a.m. that morning Assistant Dean Andy Sweet informed them by telephone the Conduct Board would meet during the day to determine their punishment.[93]

At first they were given two campuses, but the administration eventually lessened their punishment.

The rules relaxed because people began to question the validity of the whole system. This change fueled the continuing fight to abolish parietal hours and other rules that governed women's lives. Freshman women in 1966-67, the class of 1970, seem to have never bought into the system. In the spring of 1967, "the treasurer of AWS...reported that 50% of the freshmen women in Deerpath have *refused* to pay their dues; their reason being that they do not believe in AWS."[94] About the same time Kris Clausen wrote a letter to the *Stentor* saying:

> The present AWS regulations succeed only in uniting women against the administration, head-residents, and the AWS organization itself.... The AWS restrictions are founded on nineteenth century traditions and have no place in a school that professes to offer a liberal arts education.

> Unless someone can offer a reasonable explanation for these out-moded regulations—a drastic change is called for."[95]

As an example she said that freshman women were not allowed to study in the all-night study lounge. Anther woman wrote an article for the same issue of the Stentor, putting the fight against the AWS in a larger context.

> This is the first generation which is seriously challenging this standard and slowly accomplishing its abolishment.... It seems that the students on this campus have been patient enough. We have gone through all the right channels which are supposedly appropriate in a democratic society. Countless CGA, AWS, and dorm meetings have been spent discussing the crucial problems associated with women's non-academic life: dormitory room checks for women, the sign-in procedure, women's hours, women signing out to men's apartments and, of course, the big plum, parietal hours. A year and a half has passed and we have all been quite polite, well mannered and considerate of the problems involved with these areas. But haven't we been deprived a little too long now?...Let it be emphasized that our demands are not unreasonable.... After all, we are not pleading for orgies or condoning the use of drugs or asking for no rules at all.... But what we are asking for are simple rights given to many students in colleges and universities across the country.[96]

Resistance by women succeeded in getting many of the rules abolished in 1967-68. Sandra Holmes, class of 1968, explained her role in the fight:

> I was active in and ultimately President of the [Association of] Women Students. My goal was to have women treated with far more equity and respect on campus, especially by the Administration. We succeeded in getting rid of "hours" for senior women...and getting keys to our dorms. When the first senior woman got pregnant following the rule change, Howard Hoogesteger, Dean of Students,...told me that *I* was responsible! 'Anatomically impossible,' I replied![97]

Increasingly, women argued for equal treatment. They complained about the double standard by which men's rooms were keyed into only occasionally, while this happened on a regular basis in women's dorms, with dorm checks. Sometimes men got into trouble for having girls in their rooms, but the *Stentor* reported that Dean Hoogesteger unofficially "told the men of Gregory something to the effect that they could have girls in their rooms as long as they kept them in the back."[98]

By 1968 women had won the right to live off-campus, which created a whole new set of problems for them to deal with, including discriminatory policies by the town of Lake Forest.[99] According to landlords, women were unpredictable: "You never know

what some broad's going to do."[100] Moreover, the Dean's office seemed to adhere to the double standard. In 1969-70, only 12 women, but 82 men, were given off-campus releases. This was because there were a larger number of beds for women (530 beds as opposed to 490 beds for men in 1968-69[101]) that had to be filled before people would be allowed to live off-campus. The female students complained and the dean recognized that it was time to change.[102]

By 1970, as the College's enrollment swelled, the old parietal rules were entirely swept away in the effort to find enough housing for all students. Even though the number of beds was said to be equal, men outnumbered women. This prompted discussion of co-ed housing on South Campus for the following year, which would equal out the number of surplus men and women in relation to the number of beds.[103] Roberts was the supposed to be the experimental dorm in 1970-71, with "at least four or five scattered quads and at least four singles for men." As one student commented: "We're not a bunch of sexual perverts. Why can't we live next door to each other like normal people?"[104] Co-ed living was delayed until the following year, but the mindset had changed.[105]

Not everyone was happy with the change, which left only Lois, on North Campus, and Moore and Nollen, on South Campus, as all female residence halls. A woman who came to the college as a freshman in 1969 said: "I lived in Deerpath as a freshman. I didn't like the change that allowed men on the floors. As a sophomore I moved to Lois because of its atmosphere, [and because it] also had a housemother. In Deerpath [they] had a recent graduate who was worthless."[106]

Stories about what it was like to live in Moore Hall give a picture of the campus that was very different from the early 1960s. At the end of the 1967-68 school year,

Moore residents were in the "process of petitioning the administration for autonomous housing." It was the first dorm to take this initiative, sparking the comment: "Moore autonomy may mark the official recognition of feminine freedom."[107] Although Moore still had a head resident, those living there were able to create their own social rules,[108] making them more independent than any Lake Forest College dorm had ever been in the past, especially any women's dorm. The only rule instituted stated that the "criterion for living in the dorm is consideration of ones' fellow members."[109] Betsy Weane '70 described what Moore was like in its first year, 1968-69:

> I came to Lake Forest as a junior, and I was in Nollen Hall first semester. The sororities were active and lived there. I hated it. I moved to Moore Hall mid-year, which at the time was an honors hall and more 'radical'.... Nollen had all of those rules Moore didn't. I loved what felt like respect and freedom of having our own keys, our own kitchen, lounges, etc. Also the women there seemed smart as well as savvy (it was like an anti-sorority sorority).[110]

Weane's description showed how the open criteria attracted a variety of residents. Surprisingly, although Moore was the "radical dorm," her group of friends seemed tame. "Moore was a strong influence [on how I reacted to the dating scene]. Not much sex or drugs or drinking [took place] among people I hung out with.... I never ever heard anyone raise women's issues even in Moore Hall, although I am sure they did and it came from Moore; I just wasn't involved."[111]

In fact, women's issues were raised by Moore residents. In 1968 the dorm sponsored a lecture by a local doctor on "the sexual responsibility of college women, [due to the] complete lack of sex information supplied on campus."[112] Two years after Weane graduated, the atmosphere had become even more relaxed: "It was a very loose time. Especially when residing in Moore Hall, an all-girls dorm, there were many guys living there too."[113] The 1972-73 housing description included each purpose unit's ideology. Moore stated that its purpose was "to generate interest in the particular

problems of women and to establish an atmosphere conducive to the academic, artistic, and athletic endeavors of same."[114]

Sexual issues were hot topics on the campus. In the late sixties and early seventies there were many complaints about the College's policies in dealing with these topics. The 1967-68 *New Student Handbook* stated: "The college believes that the best interests of society are served by a policy that limits the sexual relationship to marriage." The *Stentor* objected to this policy.[115] A student committee was formed in 1967 after two women were "denied the information they sought concerning birth control by the College Health Office."[116] They brought a speaker to campus, a doctor from the Yale University Medical School, who educated the audience about birth control methods. The spread of sexually transmitted diseases, indicating a lack of proper protection against them, was another related problem. There were outbreaks of STDs on at least two occasions during this ten-year period.

In 1968 a *Stentor* editorial criticized the school's approach to sex education, saying that it seemed to believe that: "to open channels of information is to condone promiscuity."[117] The doctor who worked in the student health center, on the other hand, would only give moralizing lectures against using the pill. He would only give out information on birth control to "married women or to students with letters from their parents requesting that their daughter be given birth control information and materials." This prompted "freshman counselors in Deerpath...[to] supply students with the names and addresses of doctors who will give unmarried women birth control pills."[118] One woman remembered that there was one doctor in town who would give students the pill.[119]

In 1968 a *Stentor* article described abortion as "the major 'underground' tragedy of this campus," explaining that there were a "staggering number of abortions needed by LFC women each year."[120] A later article suggested the size of that number: "Apparently some 100 girls from here got abortions [in 1968-69]."[121] Donna Campbell, class of 1972, recalled that "abortions were illegal, yet the dorm bathroom door had a list of physicians who would do abortions."[122] Women students formed organizations to help combat sexually generated problems and to educate people. In 1970 the Birth Control, VD, and Pregnancy Counseling Information Committee was organized to "meet the needs of the college campus;" the group had 35 members.[123] A 1971 article explaining abortion procedures said: "the word [abortion] evokes a great deal of unnecessary fear from any person faced with the decision to terminate a pregnancy."[124] An ad was placed in the *Stentor* for Choice Incorporated, a non-profit family planning service, which stated "Abortion: lowest cost in the area (weekdays) $100."[125]

Women's attitudes at this time, which were influenced by the availability of the pill and the option to have an abortion, led to a dating scene on the campus that was drastically different from that of the previous decade. "Everyone slept with everyone else. Or, if you didn't, your roommate was. Dating? Not really—it was a big group grope."[126] A 1971 graduate told a story about her roommates, which reflected the range of attitudes women had at this time: "I had two roommates junior year. One of them was screwing anything she could find that was male. She drove my other roommate and me crazy.... It was awful."[127] In the late 1960s and early 1970s lesbian couples were first noted as being present on the campus, adding a new twist to the dating scene: "This was a time of 'burning bras.' There were many lesbian couples on campus."[128] Another woman

explained how these couples were received: "We had some lesbians on campus who were my friends—horror of horrors. That was a very unacceptable lifestyle back then."[129] A woman went to a porn film with a man to review it for the *Stentor,* so that both the man's and the woman's viewpoints could be given. She said: "Never having seen a pornographic movie before, I must admit that I set off on this venture with some trepidation. Let me hasten to assure all empathic females that no 'great events' occurred.... To my surprise, I enjoyed myself."[130] Even though the writer may have been open-minded enough to attend, she remained anonymous.

The attitude towards sororities at Lake Forest College changed greatly during this period, as was common across the country. Sororities lost favor and membership declined rapidly. Some women tried to keep the tradition alive: "A feisty group of us started our own sorority—Chi Phi Omega 1964-65. It lasted about one year due to poor organization and no history!"[131] Sororities were ridiculed, as when the *Stentor* ran a picture of the Chi Omega sorority singing, in matching paper dresses, with the caption (paraphrasing a song popular at the time) ".... They're all made of Ticky-Tacky and they all look the same, And the people in the houses, they all go to the University, And they all get put in boxes, little boxes, just the same..."[132] By 1968 "the sororities were gone.... There might have been one left but it was not an option."[133] Two women, one who graduated in 1973 and the other in 1975, said that they chose Lake Forest College in part because it did not have any sororities. "LFC did not have football, sororities or fraternities because they did not fit in with the social ideals of pacifism and social equality."[134]

On the faculty level the decade witnessed the same pattern of new attitudes on the part of women and the erosion of traditional rules limiting them professionally. A few women who joined the faculty in the 1940s (Rosemary Hale, Economics) and 1950s (Ann Bowen, Music; Rosemary Cowler and Ann Hentz, English) who gained tenure by the 1960s. One woman first joined the faculty in the 1930s (Elizabeth Teter Lunn, Biology), and came from a local family. Bowen, Cowler, Hale, and Lunn chaired their departments, mostly after the period of this study. Also, Cowler and Hale played major roles in campus committees and decision-making and Cowler achieved a named professorial chair and served as faculty marshal in the 1980s, very much a faculty leader and key decision maker.[135]

Two key issues concerning women faculty members were "nepotism" in the faculty and "sexism" in promotion and tenure of women. The *Stentor* gave both issues wide coverage, giving women students a window on problems that seemed analogous to their own. Up to 1970 an unwritten nepotism policy existed at the College that "prohibited a husband and wife from both being employed by the college full time on a continuous basis."[136] President Cole defended the rule, saying "if you hire a husband and wife, you can't really think of them as individuals. What you do to one will have some effect on the other, so they must be thought of as a couple."[137] Registrar Ruth Christiansen Sproat was forced to resign because she married a tenured professor. As her husband stated, "this seems a Victorian concept of the role of women in our society...and it raises the question of what the college would do if two tenured members of the faculty should decide to marry. In such a case the two parties would be protected by their professional organization, the AAUP."[138] Another example of someone whose marriage

made her subject to the nepotism policy was Ingrid Henkels Speros, of the German Department.

> I married one of my colleagues in the Foreign Languages Department, in August of 1969. We were aware of a nepotism policy that was in force at the College at that time, and knew that one of us would have to leave. My husband already had tenure; I did not. He was also chairman of the Foreign Languages Department and my immediate superior; here was a classic case of conflict of interest. I would have to resign, though not immediately. The College needed my services as program director abroad for the fall of 1971 and the spring of 1972.[139]

The issue resonated with many women who worked at the College. Florence Hoogesteger is yet another example of someone who sparked a series of articles in the *Stentor,* critiquing the school's nepotism policy. Faculty spouse Christine McCorkel wrote a letter stating that, while the rule appears to apply equally to both genders, "its effect is to limit the job opportunities of faculty wives." Educated wives of faculty, she said, were often considered "a convenient reservoir of coolie labor ready, willing, and even flattered to fill in for a course or a year at cut rates," but "academic odd jobs are not an academic career."[140] Other women at the College were married to faculty and were employed by the College, but not on a permanent full-time basis: Carol Gayle taught part-time and Patricia Faber worked in a full-time, temporary position.[141] Under President Hotchkiss the policy was added to the Faculty Handbook but in a limited form that prohibited people from supervising members of their family.[142] By the mid-seventies the policy faded out of existence.

In 1974 two female faculty members were denied tenure: Luretta Speiss from the Biology Department and Harriet Jauch from the Athletic Department.[143] Speiss charged that she was denied tenure "because I am a woman." At the time, there were only three women faculty members in the natural sciences, none of whom was tenured: "There seems to be a definite effort to hire at the lower levels," she said, but few women reached

the stage of tenure review. "Maybe they think that women will go away when it finally comes time for tenure."[144] Speiss filed a complaint of sex discrimination with the Fair Employment Practices Commission, which found "substantial evidence that the alleged unfair employment practice has been committed."[145] She then filed formal charges against the school in district court, saying: "You just have to make a stand somewhere, or what's the use of having convictions?"[146] Although Speiss lost her case, the controversy made a strong impression on women faculty. Former psychology professor Claire F. Michael acidly described the way the tenure process worked for women: "tenure all the mediocre men, by the time the woman shows up the slots are filled." Michaels harked back to the Speiss case, saying "before 1975, only those with true grit survived and flourished. Those who spoke out against de facto sexism in tenure decisions like Luretta Speiss were ridiculed and ostracized." [147]

The Jauch case highlighted sex discrimination in sports and led to a series of articles in the *Stentor*. The only female faculty member out of seven in the Athletic Department, Jauch was required to be proficient in many sports. Even though she had produced a winning tennis team for the past eleven years, Athletic Director John Nelson said that "Harriet really can't coach."[148] A number of female faculty members wrote in support of Jauch, charging that this was a case of sex discrimination. After promising that "a woman will be sought to replace Jauch,"[149] Nelson said that it was impossible to increase the number of women coaches. He reasoned that "there's no way we can add to the Physical Education faculty at this time, but as soon as any of the current members leave, we shall hire a woman."[150]

The larger issue behind the Jauch case was the inequality between the athletic programs for men and women. The Women's Rights Group published a letter in the *Stentor* giving a long list of reasons of unfair practices. Women had only three varsity sports to pick from, while men had nine. In basketball, men were given over eight times as many hours of gym time per week as were women. The few hours the women had were interrupted in various ways by other men's sports or individual men, who would mock and taunt the women's team. The men had a full time coach, while the women had to find their own "unqualified student coach." In tennis, women had to practice off campus because the men's team had twice as much court time. The Women's Rights group recommended adding another woman coach, more varsity sports, and more gym time for women, and a creative dance program.[151]

Improving women's athletics became a catalyst for the development of the women's movement. In 1972, the Women's Liberation Group's Committee for Equal Rights was formed. It fought instances of sex discrimination in the women's athletic program. The committee met with Coach Wasylik in April. Although gym hours for women had been extended from three hours per week to seven and a half, they asked for more "in an effort to gradually minimize discrimination against women." Wasylik replied that "he couldn't give up the hours designated for men's intramural basketball for women's varsity basketball." The women's feisty comment in their report in the *Stentor* was that "somehow we have always thought that varsity sports took priority over intramural sports, but now we know it is simply that men take priority over women." The Committee also asked for equal time on the tennis courts and a qualified basketball coach. When told that it was "financially unfeasible" to hire another woman coach, the

committee responded: "We cannot help questioning the 'financial feasibility' of having six men faculty members who teach absolutely no courses and have a composite course load of a mere four varsity sports."[152]

All through the early 1970s various dance programs encountered discrimination problems similar to those of the basketball team. "A group of girls interested in modern dance meets in the basement of Deerpath Hall and dances to the rhythm of ping pong balls and TV commercials. Similarly, folk dancers gather in Hixon Hall once weekly with...complaints of not enough room and time to dance to the mind, body and spirit's content." The article continued saying that although the modern dance group had anywhere from eight to 25 participants, they were forced to dance in the "women's PE room...to a decrepit old record player...and to [try to] keep from hitting each other." At the same time, upstairs in the gym, which was reserved for basketball, Sheila Markin "found two boys wandering around in gym shorts tossing a basketball occasionally."[153] Claiming that dancing was a positive way for women to relax and also build their confidence and self-image, women students with "dance-fever"[154] formed a creative dance group in 1971. Although the group did not last, in 1973, a modern dance class met, with an emphasis on "self-expression" and giving "the participants a 'good body image.'"[155] That same year a belly-dancing course was offered to women. The instructor said that "it can become part of a woman's life in helping her to 'express her sexuality.'"[156]

Inequality was also evident in the sparse newspaper coverage of women's athletics. Articles about women were often short, and often a variety of women's athletics were grouped together in one short article. Other times women's athletic news

was mentioned briefly in an article about men's sports. The women swimmers were referred to as "mermaids," and, as one faculty member pointed out, the female participants were referred to as girls, while the male participants were referred to as men.[157] The unequal reporting persisted despite the fact that the women's teams were generally excellent, in many cases equal or superior to the men's teams. For example, the women's swim team placed sixth in nationals in 1971.[158] In February team member Ann Fraser "shattered the two year standing American record for the 200 meter freestyle."[159] Marathon swimmer and alumna Diana Nyad made national news and impressed many women at the College. One woman recalled that "Diana Nyad....made the cover of the *New York Post*."[160] Even so, in 1971, a photograph of women playing volleyball had the sarcastic caption: "Women's Lib strikes again! This time they are attacking the male chauvinist volleyball. See the 'feminine mystique' in action at your local sports center, daily."[161]

In retrospect, many of the changes that took place on the campus in the late 1960s and early 1970s, can be seen as being part of the women's movement. But self-conscious identification with the women's liberation movement was slow to develop. In 1968, "women's issues were big—mostly, though, we focused on the small symptoms, not the societal issues."[162] A 1970 graduate explained how she came to be aware of women's situations: "My junior year I went to France and felt new consciousness of women's issues raised by how blatant the sexist relationships were in France. When I came back I read some women's liberation literature and quickly became aware—of language and roles."[163] But, in 1973, the atmosphere at Lake Forest College seemed more strongly

geared towards women's liberation. Judith A. Gates, who double majored in physics and mathematics, and earned masters and doctoral degrees, recalled:

> I was involved in the women's movement. It was very important in helping me shape my self-image and ambitions....There was a lot of awareness of equality between the sexes. We dressed in unfeminine attire and formed consciousness-raising groups. I think there was a lot of emphasis on being independent, creating our own lives independent of men—forming partnerships with men, if possible. Some women broke away from having relationships with men in order to be able to define themselves. We wanted equal pay and recognition, too....I was very serious about school and saw success as continuing [on to graduate] school....I always expected to be independent....I always saw myself in a professional career.[164]

Many women's groups were created throughout the years, most of which were intended to help women obtain information on birth control or abortion. It was not until 1972 or 1973 that issues of the feminist movement, changing how women perceived themselves and their role in society, began to be formed. In 1972 the Women's Group described its goals:

> Very few of us had had much experience with women's liberation before this. Therefore, many of us are dealing with a perspective which is really not ours yet and thus, very confusing. We are in the process of discovering what it is to be a woman with a woman's consciousness; learning to have a woman's perspective....The purpose of the group is to help women feel close to and good about each other in order to establish solidarity. They are also to help each other gain strength and confidence from the realization that being a woman is beautiful. The ultimate goal is to begin to reestablish ourselves socially, as a result of this personal readjustment, in a way that is healthier for us, for those we deal with, and for those we love.[165]

The group acknowledged that "women's liberation is not exclusive; men's and women's liberations are mutually dependent." [166] A men's liberation group, also in existence at this time, explained that they "discovered for themselves that males are uncertain and anxious over many of their roles (and hence, function). Hence, the same roles which confuse men, are the focal points of the Women's Lib thrust." This is why their group decided to "meet as a pure group for a while, in order to clear up personal matters, and to obtain a firm set of values to be later used in face of the possible barrage from the women's libbers." They continued by saying: "Later, possibly next term, the women's

lib group would be asked to join the meetings. What would happen from then on is open to pensive speculation. But, the results should be constructive."[167]

A similar initiative took place in 1976, when the Women's Concerns Housing Unit was established in Lois, with 16 members consisting of both men and women, who lived on and off campus. Their goal was to "'help develop the "full-spectrum" of their personalities'; to bring out the well-balanced and whole person by providing information and support to all people interested in confronting stereotypic sex role expectations." Despite the small size of this group, their activities were numerous, as they worked to educate students, both men and women, who were "interested in growing and extending their capabilities beyond those 'ruts of femininity or masculinity.'" [168]

An indication that women were changing along with the times was the tone some women used when they wrote articles in the College newspaper. Many women were sarcastic, straightforward, and even aggressive in getting their point across or stating their argument. Amanda Harris, who wrote for the *Stentor* in 1968, had no qualms about speaking her mind. A good example is her controversial article about a question and answer period between the administration and students. Harris's opening words were: "Last Thursday's 'Bitch In' should rightfully have been called a 'Bull Out,' for it was all the bull that the Administration handed out so freely, not the bitching of the students, that made the occasion memorable.... [Dean of Students] Hoogesteger and [President] Cole, bypassing [Dean] Necker, monopolized the floor and both gave equally evasive answers to the questions." She summarized many of the administration's other points when she wrote:

> Cole's stand on morality is that it should not be legislated. That is, not unless it is convenient. Parietals and freshman women's hours safeguard sexual morality. After all, as Hoogesteger so knowledgeably pointed out, women are "the prey of men." Also, parents must be appeased and

> parents pay the bills. The student body was also greatly reassured by Cole's statement that the college does not exist solely for the benefit of our neighbors, the residents of Lake Forest. If it were, the student body would not contain any of "the extremely questionable characters from the Eastern seaboard."

Harris laced her reporting with sarcastic comments. "When asked about the forced resignation of Mrs. Sproat because of the nepotism policy, Cole shrugged and said, 'Ah well, you win some you lose some.' He qualified this not-so-brilliant remark by the statement 'No one is indispensable.'" She ended her article with the following comment on Cole: "He foresees open dorms for women. After all, just the fact that he is partially responsible for changing women's hours from 8:30 p.m. in 1960 is strong evidence of Cole's powerful leadership. One must sympathize with Cole's position, however, and agree with his closing comment, 'Even being God ain't no bed of roses.' How tragic."[169]

Harris's article "generated more controversy than had ever been anticipated," said the *Stentor.* [170] It is an example of the more rebellious nature of students in the sixties (although Lake Forest students' rebellions were more tame than students at Berkeley or Columbia), and of their new confrontational attitude that made it difficult for them to communicate with the administration. The *Stentor*'s reply to the criticisms was unrepentant. "Perhaps...the article did point to some of the reasons...why the gap between the generations is so great." Students at this time were more demanding of their superiors, more likely to question what was told to them instead of just accepting it. "If the Administration, for example, could give us solid reasons why Mrs. Sproat was fired, or why women must be in their dormitories at a specified hour, then maybe such articles would never be written. The problem is the administration has failed to 'tell it like it is.'...The student generation of today, and the students here, will not buy their absurd explanations."[171]

A Generation Gap conference held a month later was supposed to help bridge the gap between the generations. Instead it caused a greater rift:

> The Administration has acted in bad faith. The conference is ostensibly for the benefit of the student body; however, little effort has been made to understand what problems students would like to discuss....Take, for example, the question "What is the significance of the rather bizarre dress of some, their aversion to soap, razors and barber/beauty shops?" Why not ask Ann Landers?...The idea of a "Generation Gap" conference is a good one in itself. But this is not enough, especially for a liberal arts educational institution. We are not subjects for analysis. We do not want to be talked at, we do not want to be told why we constitute a gap. We want to talk with, engage in a dialogue with the speakers and guests, we want to tell them how it is, and we want to learn.[172]

In the late 1960s a pipe bomb was thrown into the Dean's office, creating more distrust between the students and the administration.

On more than one occasion censorship controversies over the literary magazine *Tusitalia* were mentioned in the *Stentor*. For example, *Tusitalia's* 1968 cover was supposed to be a drawing of a full-frontal nude figure, raising "the pubic hair question."[173] The school printer's religious principles made him uneasy about printing certain materials. He wanted to "avoid the entire moral decision of whether projected illustrations are art or pornography."[174] President Cole gave him the permission to refuse, but also told the students they could bring the magazine to another printer if they so desired.[175] Cole said this meant he was not censoring the publication, although the students disagreed, because they could not afford to go to an outside printer, which meant that certain drawings had to be cut from the publication.

While relatively few respondents to the questionnaire complained of sexual harassment or gender bias, whether by faculty or students, inside or outside the classroom, it is interesting to note that there were many more references to occurrences during this period than in any other. This fits in with a nationwide trend. "A Gallup survey in 1962 indicated that only about one-third of American women considered

themselves victims of discrimination. Eight years later the proportion had risen to half, and by 1974 to two-thirds. By any standard these were striking measures of social and cultural change."[176] This suggests that women's consciousness was changing, rather than that discrimination increased twofold. What follows are excerpts of what Lake Forest College women in this period said in their responses to the questionnaire about how they perceived what happened to them.

A few women had unpleasant or even bitter memories about academic gender discrimination or sexual harassment in academic matters. A 1966 graduate said that she "had scored quite high on the math SATs (740, as I recall), and I was told that because of that I need not take any more math at LFC. In retrospect, I realize that a door was closed in my face, but I know I could have opened it if I had wanted to." [177] Susan K. Lynch, class of 1967, believed that men and women were "absolutely" treated differently in the classroom and charged that women were unfairly kept out of some fields by referring to "the only woman in my class allowed to major in economics." [178] Another woman recalled a "male 'friend' advising me to be less scholarly, and to excel less in class discussions. At the time, I was shocked to get such 'advice.'"[179] Margaret S. Thompson, class of 1970, recalls no gender bias, but she does remember that "in some classes (government, history) men frequently dominated class discussions."[180] One person asserted that the psychology department was very "anti-woman."[181] Sunny Lo, now a chemist for the Dow Corning Corporation, graduated in 1975 with a double major in chemistry and math, remembered that she was told by her chemistry professor that she was "a cookbook chemist and would never be any good!"[182]

Other women had disturbing stories about seduction or sexual harassment by faculty. Respondents spoke of gossip about affairs between students and professors, and one woman spoke of a "gay friend who was seduced by a professor," but he "enjoyed this."[183] One woman was working on a senior thesis with a professor who made sexual advances toward her:

> [He] decided we needed to have a "love-in" to get really close to each other and work better. That was his excuse to paw me. I thought it was funny and pathetic and sad. I didn't think of it as sexual harassment.... My grade didn't suffer. I told him he needed to spend more time with his wife and stop fooling around. He stopped bothering me."[184]

A 1973 graduate replied that there was sexual harassment on the campus, although it was not labeled as such.

> It was impossible to get the administration to respond appropriately to the inappropriate sexual advances of certain faculty members. The "old boy" network protected professors who would have been found guilty and fired in the '90s. A chairman of one of the departments fondled and propositioned for years and nothing was done about it even after a group of women reported it. There was no mechanism to file complaints or stop the abuse of power by some of the male professors. (The male students were not the sexual harassers in the early '70s.)[185]

At the beginning of the 1970s women's courses began to enter the curriculum—but not without resistance. In the spring of 1972, the first women's issues courses were designed, to be offered in the 1972-73 school year. The Philosophy Department proposed a course to be taught by a female member of the department, dealing with "the nature of women's oppression, the concept of rights in relation to the women's situation, the female nature, and the goals of feminism and human liberation." It was rejected by the Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA); they did not believe the philosophy department had enough faculty to add an extra course and still adequately cover the existing courses. Also, said the committee, Barat College was already covering these topics, making them unnecessary at Lake Forest College. [186] Students protested the decision, saying that Barat only offered courses dealing with women in literature,

politics, and economics, but not philosophy.[187] Some 300 people signed a petition to show support for the course, and 35 students indicated an interest in taking the proposed course. This caused the CAA to change its decision, allowing the course to be taught. Immediately following the feminist philosophy class discussion, the first psychology course about women was planned, to be taught by Phylis Frankel. [188] The new philosophy and psychology courses, along with a Freshman Seminar entitled "Women's Liberation," [189] were the "first academic courses specifically devoted to the problems of women in American society."[190]

In 1974, a women's studies major was proposed. This was denied, but after a struggle and faculty veto of the APC's original decision the Academic Policies Committee (APC) eventually accepted the formation of a faculty advisory committee. Still, they would not allow it to be acknowledged on student transcripts that they had a concentration in women's studies.[191] A woman student noted: "I wasn't aware of the women's movement at that time. I was aware that educational standards were being battered at the time, but LFC held steady to a core curriculum. Those pressures were not apparent in any of my classes."[192] The changes in curriculum were minor; even with the new women's studies program, the school was still not taking great strides to give women curricular options. A student who wanted to major in Women's Studies explained that she was "surprised and amazed at the levels of irrational opposition we faced."[193]

Women, or more specifically staff, faculty and faculty wives, were supportive of women students in a variety of ways. In 1966, Doris Cole, wife of the College's President, spoke at the Association of Women Students' and Women's Recreation Association's Banquet. She explained that the college years were a time when a woman

was "discovering most dramatically what it means to be a woman" and that "women today are often 'caught in the crossfire between two positions.' They may have won women's rights, but may feel guilty if they neglect the duties of a housewife for those of a career. 'At some point...we each have to chose for ourselves."[194] In 1970 Karen Gean, wife of philosophy instructor Bill Gean, organized a group to educate women about birth control and abortion.[195] In January of 1973 a forum entitled "A Woman's Choice" was announced. The idea came from Campus Circle's organization of women faculty members and faculty's wives. The forum was to include a variety of speakers and a career open house with women from some 40 non-traditional women's careers—it was specified that no elementary school teachers would be present. [196] A woman who graduated in 1973 explained that:

> It was a time when women seemed more professionally driven than the male students. A majority of the female students I knew planned to go to medical school, law school, or graduate school. I only had two female friends who ended their educations with a BA. (I knew more male students who did not pursue graduate education.) The faculty was very responsive to this group of women who were products of the women's movement and wanted more. They encouraged us and helped us pursue professional careers.[197]

A similar program was organized in 1975 by Carol Gayle and Rosemary Hale, an economics professor, which worked to educate women about career opportunities in the mid 1970s, because women hadn't "been thinking in terms of careers....Women...tend to drift, and fall into whatever opportunities seem available." Gayle and Hale invited women speakers who were in careers female students had expressed an interest in, such as law, to speak to the students.[198]

Women faculty members acted as role models to the female students, but just "the fact that there are so few women faculty members presents a barrier to many female students in realizing their full potential." According to an article by Renee Kampf in the

Stentor in 1974: "'There is little basis for women to become aware of their academic opportunities,' stated Annette Wallace. 'Role models must be established for women in the form of more female faculty members, particularly within the fields of philosophy, chemistry, and biology.'"[199]

Some graduates went on to have impressive careers. Marcia Gillespie is currently the editor-in-chief of the feminist *Ms.* magazine. But although women had more options, they were not always guided as to how they could be utilized. Even in 1972, "Women were just starting to become MD's. It was still rare....Girls didn't grow up being told we could be doctors, or athletes."[200] Margaret S. Thompson reflected on her experience:

> A real shortcoming of my education at LFC was the total lack of career counseling. I did get an elementary education teaching credential, but there was no major in education and so the courses were not as much in depth as they might have been. I studied to be a teacher because that was a track assumed to be a traditional route for women. My initial assumption was to work as a teacher to put my husband through graduate school and then stay home raising children.[201]

She ended up working at a variety of jobs, most involved helping children; she is now a free lance calligrapher and artist. Some women were forced to become independent later in life:

> I thought I would have the traditional 2.4 kids/suburbia marriage. For 13 years it went that way. Then when our son was born [my husband] left within four months for a ten-year younger lady. The one he finally married is 17 years younger. I grew up fast, got my MAT and have been teaching for the past 12 years. Not what I expected, but I'm a better, stronger person for it.[202]

Peggy Rouh, class of 1973, planned on working in a traditional women's role, but found the position did not suit her: "I thought I would teach school. I always planned on a career. In fact, I left teaching after a year—very unfulfilling. I have been with IBM for 25 years and am a senior manager with 55 professionals reporting to me."[203]

The attitudes of women who graduated in era of the late sixties and early seventies showed that times had changed. No longer were women expected to marry and

have a family right after graduation. Attitudes varied among individuals, but those who spoke of wanting to be more independent, at least for awhile, were the ones who were most representative of the time. "I wanted to marry a man who could support me in the style I liked, and eventually I did. At the same time, I didn't want to rush it. Being single was fun."[204] A significant number of women were confused by the questionnaire's question about family expectations. A 1969 graduate actually crossed out the question about family expectations and wrote: "I decided education is a top priority and am now in my second term as a school board member."[205] Someone else wrote: "I'm not clear what you mean. I had a boyfriend but wasn't ready to get married. We fought over women's issues and broke up when I went out west."[206] Another woman questioned: "Do you mean having children? There seemed so much to do first—further education, career, and fun. I didn't start thinking of children until I was 27. Took me until I was 38 to get there."[207] A contented 1973 graduate wrote: "The women's movement allowed female students of my generation to delay family and pursue a professional career first. I got a Ph.D. and the job I wanted before marrying and having children. I got to 'have it all.'"[208] Another woman had a similar experience: "I did not expect to have a family. I was very focused on finding my own way, being independent. I did marry and have one son, after much thought. My husband was very supportive of my needs."[209]

In her response to the Women at Lake Forest College questionnaire, Patricia Medeiros, class of 1966, wrote a great deal about her experiences with women faculty members in the 1960s and her later family and career. Her story exemplifies many struggles of women from this era. She described her experiences at the College:

> I had the sense that we were all expected to perform at a pretty high level, but I had no sense of being deferred to, of having less expected of me, or of having to outperform the males in my classes for the same rewards. This may be partly because I was fortunate enough to be in the

> classes of two remarkable women, Ann Hentz and Rosemary Cowler. These were the first truly intellectual women I had ever known, and they had a profound effect on my understanding of a woman's place in academia. They were brilliant scholars and appeared to be happy and fulfilled as single women. For me this was a revelation, as I had always believed that true fulfillment for a woman came only through marriage and a family, that unmarried women were necessarily incomplete, sad old maids. I was not part of the generation of women who believed they could have it all; it seems to me that I always knew that sacrifices would have to be made, and I chose to put my career on the back burner in favor of my family. If anything, I was able to pursue my career more than I might have expected, earning respect and some autonomy while still teaching only part-time. I went to graduate school as a temporizing measure--and stayed until I had a Ph.D. and a Mrs. Then I taught part-time at a number of colleges. I consciously and deliberately put my career second to my husband's [when we moved] to Canada and various places in the U.S. as his career advanced. Then I was divorced at the age of 45, when my children were teenagers, and since then I have taught full-time. I have developed a very satisfying professional life, and I find myself thinking often of Ann Hentz and Rosemary Cowler, reflecting on how my life has turned out much more like theirs than I would have dreamed at the age of eighteen.[210]

This story shows how women who went to school in the transitional period, before the feminist movement but after the conservative 1950s, had to struggle with making decisions that their mothers never had to consider. Women felt torn between family and career, and while they were more likely to choose family, they were now conscious that they were making sacrifices, for better or worse.

The early to mid 1970s was a time for hedonism, which left many of the passionate struggles of the earlier days in the dust. The ideals of the 1960s were traded in for a less hopeful, more cynical outlook on the world. The Vietnam War was over, and politics took a back burner to drugs and other self-indulging pleasures. Apathy was once again a hot topic in the *Stentor*, and intellectualism was on the decline.

> "I was more aware of the women's movement when I was in high school. All issues (Vietnam, liberation, and civil rights) were more intense and emotional in the late sixties and early seventies. By '73 when I attended LFC it was time for hedonism....Those of us who grew up in the sixties and who had any intellectual curiosity at all were totally affected by Watergate and the Vietnam War. It was somewhat discouraging to find so many at LF oblivious to those events....There was little or no political involvement in '73 to '75 at LF. The war was over and we were jaded and bored. It had all happened."[211]

The 1973 survey of freshmen attitudes "appeared to indicate that the political outlook of LFC's freshmen class is moving in a somewhat conservative direction."[212]

The women's movement also seemed stalemated. In more women seemed ignorant about birth control and related matters, because the feminist educational groups that handed out brochures a few years earlier no longer were active. One woman remarked that she had "spoken with a number of girls who weren't using any kind of contraceptives." It was felt that the services of a gynecologist were needed on the campus; they decided to make one available.[213] The following year a sexuality workshop was held,[214] and a survey of the students' sexual opinions and habits was published. It showed that Lake Forest College women were more conservative than the national average.[215]

Even so, one could see signs of wider acceptance of gender equality among students. Male students condemned the football coach for making a sexist remark,[216] and men and women worked together to understand each other with the formation of the Women's Concerns Housing Unit.[217] Faculty also saw improvements. A former faculty member explained how the campus changed for the better for women faculty:

> Gradually, more and more women who could succeed in playing the man's game were hired. Their sheer presence softened the faculty—made it a gentler, kinder, and more human place for everybody. In some ways, that was the real revolution—LFC went from a place where only the personal powerhouses (e.g., Rosemary Cowler) and hard-nosed feminists (e.g., Stephanie Riger) could survive to a more supportive atmosphere. The same went for gay men back then—they dated and married women and had to fit into the "real-man"-valuing culture. You must realize, of course, that academe was much better in this regard than the real world.[218]

The role of women students at Lake Forest College changed significantly as a result of the upheavals that took place on campuses nationwide during the 1960s. During this era, women began to see and work to change what they felt was wrong with their roles in the college and larger world. Women were demanding their right to choose whether or not they wanted curfew hours, men in their dorm rooms, regulations on their

dress, or sororities, to choose to use birth control or have an abortion or not, and to choose any combination of marriage, children and career that they desired.

Granted Lake Forest College was not the center of the student rebellion. It was not Columbia, nor was it Berkeley. But undeniably, there was ferment on the campus. The Nerve Center was responsible for organizing anti-war groups across the Midwest, evidence that Lake Forest College was an active community. Women played an active role, although the number of leadership positions they held is not clear (or it was not high), but their involvement is significant in and of itself. There were still those who watched events from a distance, in support of their efforts; this is a role more in line with the early 1960s way of thinking. For women to change so dramatically that they were willing to speak out about what they felt was wrong with the U.S. was a big step, and it paved the way for them to speak out about what was wrong with how women were treated in the U.S.

The possible reasons for sororities' brief hiatus on the Lake Forest College campus are varied and are difficult to pinpoint. The alumnae's questionnaires pointed to possible reasons. Maybe women were rebelling against their traditional roles, and that meant not being a part of a social organization that encouraged them to prepare for a life as a wife who entertains and dresses well to impress her husband's business clients. Maybe it was a time of sisterhood, when women were more likely to band together anyway, and the need for sororities was not there. Men did not have other aspects of their lives, other than the threat of being drafted, questioned as much as the women did. They did not have as many personal battles to fight. Women were fighting to get rid of parietal hours and housemothers. Women were fighting for their right to have classes

taught that pertained to their own lives, instead of the lives of male political or historical figures, or to have equal time in the gym or on the tennis courts. Women students were looking around, and seeing that the nepotism policy was affecting women faculty; there was never mention of any male faculty member losing his position due to his wife's tenure or seniority. Women were looking around, and seeing female faculty members such as Harriet Jauch and Luretta Speiss being denied tenure, with both women claiming that discrimination against women was the reason. Women were looking around, and seeing that the pill could not be distributed on the campus, even though (still illegal) abortions were common. Women had cause to be concerned, and to want to change how things worked.

African-American women were struggling to fill a larger role in the civil rights movement, or in BSBA, yet they had to deal with discrimination because they were women as they were working within a group fighting discrimination. Perhaps Caucasian women were facing similar problems. Men were still in charge of most organizations, writing most articles about political events in the *Stentor,* leading the campus in student government leadership positions, etc. There is a reason that the order of movements can be listed as the civil rights, then anti-war, and then, finally, the women's movement. It took women fighting in the first two battles to see that they had their own cause to champion.

Women's expectations for their lives after graduation were changing. No longer did most women go to college to find a husband. In the 1960s women began to realize that they had other options. It became more common for women to go on to graduate school, or to stay single after graduating and pursue their own interests. Women were no

longer content to let men rule their lives, and some men did not know how to deal with this new breed of women.

[1] Maureen Sue Berkowitz, 1969, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[2] Anonymous, '69:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[3] Anonymous, '73:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[4] Anonymous, '69:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[5] Anonymous, '72:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[6] Donna Campbell, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[7] Donna Campbell, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[8] Anonymous, '71:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[9] Rosemary E. Cowler, Faculty, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[10] Anonymous, '71:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[11] X. Quinntrain, "Rob Pulleyn Happening Transforms Hixon Hall," *Stentor* (Vol 82, No. 28, May 30, 1968) 6.
[12] "Dogs, cats, and snakes complicate room cleaning," *Stentor*, (Vol 85, No. 1, September 1, 1970) 1-2.
[13] Anonymous, '71:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[14] Sue Wood, "Intellectual Zoo," *Stentor* (Vol 81, No. 25, April 28, 1967) 2.
[15] "To The Editor of the Stentor," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 17, February 21, 1969) 2.
[16] Jody Broeckl, "Feeding habits of wildlife, or a trip to Szabo Zoo," *Stentor* (Vol. 78, No. 14, January 28, 1972) 6.
[17] Scott Fossel, photo, Stentor, (Vol.1 No. 1, April 1, 1973) 1.
[18] Dave Close, "South Campus: is it just another zoo?" *Stentor*, (Vol. 88 No. 20, March 22, 1974) 3.
[19] Anonymous, '74:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[20] Anonymous, '70:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[21] Anonymous, '68:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[22] Anonymous, '70:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[23] Anonymous, '69:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[24] Michael Isserman and Michael Kazin. *America Divided*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. 170.
[25] "Local Chapter of SDS Calls First Meeting," *Stentor* (Vol. 80, No. 12, January 14, 1966) 4.
[26] Bill McBean, "Rubin addresses 'prison,'" *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 9, November 14, 1969) 3.
[27] Sheila Nielsen, 1971, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[28] Carolyn S. Vaughan, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[29] Judith A. Gates, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[30] "Faculty pledges support to strike," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 26, May 8, 1970) 2.
[31] "College mourns dual tragedy" *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 26, May 8, 1970) 4-5.
[32] Ken Cohen, "Nerve Center emphasizes coordination of activities," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 28, May 22, 1970) 1.
[33] "Nerve becomes nationwide," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 7, October 30, 1970) 4.
[34] "Nervous Breakdown," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 8, November 6, 1970) 2.
[35] "Nerve Center gains recognition," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 10, November 19, 1971) 1.
[36] "Nerve expands activities in its third year," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 3, October 1, 1971) 1.
[37] "Strike effects persist," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 2, September 25, 1970) 1.
[38] Anonymous, c.1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[39] Anonymous, '73:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[40] Anonymous, '69:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[41] Steve Logowitz, "Drug Activity Initiates Action," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 15, February 9, 1968) 1.
[42] Peter Smith, "LFC freshmen don't appreciate being average," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 15, February 6, 1970) 4.
[43] "Drug problem surfaces," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 8, November 6, 1970) 1.
[44] Anonymous, '74:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[45] Anonymous, '73:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[46] Anonymous, '73:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[47] "Co-op store offers supplies at discounts," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 10, November 20, 1970) 4.
[48] Margaret Crowl, "The houses Necker built," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 4, October 8, 1971) 1.
[49] "Examination of Co-op kitchen raises questions," *Stentor*, (Vol. 88, No. 18, March 8, 1974) 1.
[50] Anne Hazard, "Communal living experiment set for fall," *Stentor*, (Vol. 84, No. 22, April 10, 1970) 3.
[51] Don Klein, "Co-op seeks help in fighting obstacles," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 24, April 24, 1970) 1.

[52] Patricia Medeiros, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[53] Anonymous, '69:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[54] Anonymous, '70:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[55] "To Call or Question," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 4, October 13, 1967) 2.
[56] "Soul Week" Issue of *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 13, January 26, 1968).
[57] EMC, "White Action," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 29, June 7, 1968) 2.
[58] "Black Stimulus," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 14, February 2, 1968) 2.
[59] Anonymous, '73:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[60] Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin. *America Divided.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000) 228.
[61] John C. Moffett, "Don't Call Us," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 21, April 12, 1968) 2.
[62] Anonymous, '72:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[63] John C. Moffett, "Don't Call Us," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 21, April 12, 1968) 2.
[64] Russell H. Jackson, "Honkie Holiday," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 21, April 12, 1968) 2.
[65] Cheryl D. Phillips, 1969, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[66] Stephen Harris, "New BSBA trend seen," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 7, October 31, 1969) 1.
[67] Margaret S. Thompson, 1970, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[68] "BSBA changes priorities," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 12, January 16, 1970) 1.
[69] Cheryl D. Phillips, 1969, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[70] Anonymous, '68:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[71] "Rev. Jesse Jackson Will Lecture At Wednesday's Convo," *Stentor* (Vol. 81, No. 21, March 31, 1967) 5.
[72] "Rush condemns LFC 'lackeys,'" *Stentor*, (Vol. 84, No. 25, May 1, 1970) 1.
[73] Kathy Welch, "New black theater group to produce modern humor," *Stentor*, (Vol. 84, No. 7, October 31, 1969) 5.
[74] Norman Frink, "Black Rap allegations subject of investigation," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 4, October 9, 1970) 1.
[75] BSBA, "Dooley committee performance attacked," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 8, November 6, 1970) 2.
[76] Anonymous, F:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[77] Cheryl D. Phillips, 1969, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[78] "Discrimination in YAF Clause Prevents CGA OK," *Stentor*, (Vol. 80, No. 17, February 18, 1966) 6.
[79] Milan Vlaisavlievich, "YAF Organization in Planning Stages," *Stentor* (Vol. 80, No. 1, October 1, 1965) 2.
[80] Anonymous, '67:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[81] John Stowe, "Campus Tends to be Liberal Politically," *Stentor* (Vol. 80, No. 16, February 11, 1966) 4.
[82] Karen Kuhlman, "GOP club fades out," *Stentor* (Vol. 8, No. 6, October 18, 1970) 3.
[83] White Students for White Action, "'Silent' White Group Reacts to BSBA," *Stentor* (Vol.83, No. 30, May 30, 1969) 2.
[84] "Clandestine group started by whites as BSBA replica," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 30, May 30, 1969) 1.
[85] White Students for White Action, "'Silent' White Group Reacts to BSBA," *Stentor* (Vol.83, No. 30, May 30, 1969) 2.
[86] Tom Rosenthal, "White Student Notes 'Sickness' of WSWA," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 30, May 30, 1969) 5.
[87] D.E. Bartlett, "WSWA 'equality' checked," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 32, June 6, 1969) 2.
[88] Diana M. Johnson, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[89] Anonymous, '67:3, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[90] Sandra Holmes, 1968, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[91] Patricia Medeiros, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[92] "AWS Approves 30 Minute Rule," *Stentor* (Vol. 80, No. 6, November 12, 1966) 4.
[93] "Distortion of Justice," *Stentor* (Vol. 81, No. 5, October 8, 1966) 2.
[94] An Involved Student, "Oh! Those Freshman Girls," *Stentor* (Vol. 81, No. 19, March 3, 1967) 5.
[95] Kris Clausen, "AWS Mess," *Stentor* (Vol. 81, No. 14, January 27, 1967) 2.
[96] "Patience: A Virtue?" *Stentor* (Vol. 81, No. 14, January 27, 1967) 2.
[97] Sandra Holmes, 1968, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[98] "Bad Faith in North Hall," *Stentor*, (Vol. 81, No. 22, April 7, 1967) 2.
[99] George Helner, "Town Council Debates Open Housing," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 25, May 10, 1968) 1.

[100] Terry Pearl, "Housing Hard to Find in LF," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 11, January 12, 1968) 1.
[101] Bonnie Lillenthal, "Hoogesteger cites off-campus rules regarding housing," *Stentor*, (Vol. 83, No. 7, November 1, 1968) 1.
[102] Denise Frieder, "Hoogesteger, women agree housing-ration change due," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 3, October 3, 1969) 1.
[103] Don Klein, "Coed housing possible for next fall," *Stentor*, (Vol. 84, No. 23, April 17, 1970) 1.
[104] "Co-ed living trial set for Roberts," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 29, May 29, 1970) 1.
[105] "Co-ed dorm delayed," *Stentor*, (Vol. 85, No. 1, September 18, 1970) 1.
[106] Peggy Rouh, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[107] "Cole Affirms Moore Autonomy As Proposal Moves On To Trustees," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 28, May 30, 1968) 1.
[108] J.C.N., "Confrontation—Step 1," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 27, May 24, 1968) 2.
[109] "Increased responsibility emphasized in Moore Hall's liberalized system," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 2, September 27, 1968) 1.
[110] Betsy Weane, 1970, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[111] Betsy Weane, 1970, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[112] "Local doctor to discuss birth control here," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 5, October 18, 1968) 1.
[113] Donna Campbell, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[114] "1972-73 Housing information," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 26, May 12, 1972) A.
[115] "Hex on Sex," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 1, September 22, 1967) 2.
[116] Bill Walz, "Birth Control and Sex: Subjects for Concern," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 9, November 17, 1967) 4.
[117] "To be or not to be," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 5, October 18, 1968) 2.
[118] "Local doctor to discuss birth control here," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 5, October 18, 1968) 1.
[119] Leslie Wilder, 1968, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[120] "To be or not to be," *Stentor* (Vol. 83, No. 5, October 18, 1968) 2.
[121] Marcia Peterson. "Group promotes abortion aid, info," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 27, May 15, 1970) 4.
[122] Donna Campbell, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[123] Debbie Osborne. "Information service formed to fill need," *Stentor* (Vol 85, No. 7, October 30, 1970) 3.
[124] "Abortion fear needless," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 21, April 16, 1971) 2.
[125] "Abortion" *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 11, November 30, 1973) 7.
[126] Anonymous, '74:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[127] Sheila Nielsen, 1971, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[128] Donna Campbell, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[129] Anonymous, '73:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[130] N. Sheridan Lane and Rhonda Ravine, "'How to Succeed' a success," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 23, April 17, 1970) 4.
[131] Marsha Feine Bodine, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[132] "More on the Fraternities," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 2, September 29, 1967) 4.
[133] Carolyn S. Vaughan, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[134] Anonymous, '73:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[135] Arthur Miller, college archivist, personal interview, April 2000.
[136] "Question Unwritten Policies: Registrar Marries Must Resign Post 19 Years at LFC," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No.12, January 19, 1968) 1.
[137] "Question Unwritten Policies: Faculty Questions Necessity, Wisdom of Ban on Couples," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No.12, January 19, 1968) 1.
[138] "Question Unwritten Policies: Faculty Questions Necessity, Wisdom of Ban on Couples," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No.12, January 19, 1968) 1.
[139] Ingrid Speros, faculty 1964-72, LFC Women Questionnaire. Speros, in the later 1990s, returned to work at the College as the President's assistant. Thirty years later, George and Ingrid Speros both work in North Hall, their offices down the hall from one another.
[140] Christine McCorkel, "Nepotism Decried," *Stentor* (Vol 82, No. 14, February 2, 1968) 2.
[141] "Question Unwritten Policies: Faculty Questions Necessity, Wisdom of Ban on Couples," Stentor (Vol. 82, No.12, January 19, 1968) 1. Carol Gayle is now an Associate Professor of History and

Associate Director of the Masters of Liberal Studies Program, and Patricia Faber for many years headed the chemistry department at Barat College.

[142] "Nepotism policy offers leeway," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 11, January 15, 1971) 3.

[143] "Speiss, Jauch speak out," *Stentor*, (Vol. 88, No. 22, April 5, 1974) 3.

[144] Renee Kampf, "Spiess, Jauch speak out," *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 22, April 5, 1974) 3.

[145] "FEPC finds evidence to support Speiss charge," *Stentor* (Vol. 89, No. 16, January 31, 1975) 1.

[146] "Speiss vs. LFC: case to be taken to court," *Stentor* (Vol 89, No. 24, April 11, 1975) 1, 3.

[147] Claire F. Michaels, Faculty, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[148] Nelson Frink, "Nelson nixes Jauch contract," *Stentor*, (Vol 88, no. 12, January 11, 1974) 1-2.

[149] Nelson Frink, "Nelson nixes Jauch contract," *Stentor*, (Vol 88, no. 12, January 11, 1974) 1-2.

[150] "Speiss, Jauch speak out," *Stentor*, (Vol. 88, No. 22, April 5, 1974) 3.

[151] D. Becker, J. Gates, J. Sherrer, "Women find LFC prejudicial," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 20, April 7, 1972) 2.

[152] Donna Becker, Judy Gates, Jane Sherrer, "Lib group confronts Wasylik," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 23, April 21, 1972) 2.

[153] Sue Sherard, "Cramped quarters distress dancers," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 18, February 27, 1970) 3.

[154] "Contagious dancing fever infects winterized students," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 12, January 22, 1971) 3.

[155] "Modern dance aids body image," *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 6, October 19, 1973) 6.

[156] "Belly-dancing shakes LFC campus," *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 3, September 28, 1973) 3.

[157] William D. Gean, "Gean cites Stentor chauvinism," *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 23, April 19, 1974) 2.

[158] "Women's swim team places sixth in national tourney," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 21, April 16, 1971) 6.

[159] Baxter Delheim, "College Mermaids excel in swim carnival," *Stentor* (Vol. 85, No. 14, February 5, 1971) 5.

[160] Anonymous, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[161] "Women's Lib strikes again!" *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 7, October 29, 1971) 6.

[162] Sandra Holmes, 1968, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[163] Anonymous, '70:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[164] Judith A. Gates, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[165] The Women's Group, "Women's Group examines goals," *Stentor* (Vol.86, No. 15, February 4, 1972) 3.

[166] The Women's Group, "Women's Group examines goals," *Stentor* (Vol.86, No. 15, February 4, 1972) 3.

[167] Tom McElvain, "Men's Lib holds initial meeting," *Stentor* (Vol.86, No. 15, February 4, 1972) 3.

[168] Marcia Riefer, "Newest housing unit plans year's programs," *Stentor* (Vol. 91, No. 5, October 15, 1976) 4.

[169] Amanda Harris, "'Bull Out', Not 'Bitch In', Staged in Commons," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 17, February 23, 1968) 1.

[170] "Telling It Like It Is," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 18, March 1, 1968) 2.

[171] "Telling It Like It Is," *Stentor*, (Vol. 82, No. 18, March 1, 1968) 2.

[172] Nick Bauman, "Whose Conference," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 22, April 19, 1968) 2.

[173] Patricia Cleekner, "Censorship Shocking," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 12, January 19, 1968) 2.

[174] "Printing office cuts Tusitala drawings again," *Stentor*, (Vol. 83, No. 23, April 11, 1969) 3.

[175] Ruth Winter, "In Defense of Cole," *Stentor* (Vol. 82, No. 14, February 2, 1968) 2.

[176] James T. Patterson. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996) 644.

[177] Patricia Medeiros, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[178] Susan K. Lynch, 1967, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[179] Anonymous, '69:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[180] Maragaret S. Thompson, 1970, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[181] Peggy Rouh, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[182] Sunny Lo, 1975, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[183] Susan Rankin, 1967, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[184] Sheila Nielsen, 1971, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[185] Anonymous, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.

[186] "Feminist course rejected," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 28, May 26, 1972) 1.

[187] Joanne Lederman, Ruth Hanckel, Anne Frost, "Feminist Philosophy course rejected," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 28, May 26, 1972) 2.

[188] "Feminist course 'in,'" *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 29, June 2, 1972) 1.
[189] "Feminist course rejected," *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 28, May 26, 1972) 1.
[190] "Feminist course 'in,'" *Stentor* (Vol. 86, No. 29, June 2, 1972) 1.
[191] "'Women's Studies' to Faculty," *Stentor* (c.April 26, 1974) 5.
[192] Anonymous, '75:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[193] Susan Smith, "APC ok's Women's Studies sequence," *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 26, may 10, 1974) 2.
[194] "Cole Talk, Kudos, Beef Up Annual Feminine Food Fest," *Stentor* (Vol. 80, No. 30, June 3, 1966) 1.
[195] Marcia Peterson. "Group promotes abortion aid, info," *Stentor* (Vol. 84, No. 27, May 15, 1970) 4.
[196] "Forum planned: "A Woman's Choice," *Stentor* (Vol. 87, No. 14, January 19, 1973) 3.
[197] Anonymous, '73:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[198] Mary Hummel, "Women explore careers," *Stentor* (Vol. 89, No. 15, January 24, 1975) 3.
[199] Renee Kampf, "Students express concern, see possible sexism at LFC," *Stentor* (Vol. 88, No. 24, April 26, 1974) 3.
[200] Donna Campbell, 1972, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[201] Margaret S. Thompson, 1970, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[202] Anonymous, '73:4, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[203] Peggy Rouh, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[204] Anonymous, '68:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[205] Anonymous, '69:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[206] Anonymous, '70:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[207] Anonymous, '71:1, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[208] Anonymous, '73:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[209] Judith A. Gates, 1973, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[210] Patricia Medeiros, 1966, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[211] Anonymous, '75:2, LFC Women Questionnaire.
[212] Alyce Coffey, "Freshmen seen shifting in political, economic status," *Stentor* (Vol. 87, No. 28, May 25, 1973) 1.
[213] Leslie Adler, "Need for sex services on campus examined," *Stentor* (Vol. 89, No. 20, March 14, 1975) 3.
[214] "If you don't stop doing it, you'll go blind," Stentor (Vol. 91, No. 10, November 19, 1976) 5.
[215] "Sex survey results—part two," Stentor (Vol. 91, No. 13, January 14, 1977) 3.
[216] Jerry Chadwick, Kris Brown, Dan Brovarney, Jackie Neff, "Dau a chauvinist?" *Stentor* (Vol. 90, No. 4, October 8, 1976) 2.
[217] Marcia Riefer, "Newest housing unit plans new year's programs," *Stentor* (Vol. 91, No. 5, October 15, 1976) 4.
[218] Claire F. Michaels, Faculty, LFC Women Questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the differences between women in the 1950s and the 1960s, with an emphasis on dramatic changes that took hold, affecting women during in the 1960s. Women's roles changed dramatically; the progression of changes is evident in the amount of freedom realized by women, by how aggressively women worked to obtain greater freedom from the administration, and society's perception of what women were supposed to do with their lives.

Decisive factors in the evolution of change for women were national and international events that converged, affecting women throughout United States. Lake Forest College was no exception. Women here were active in the civil rights and anti-war movement, fighting for their rights as Americans. This experience showed them that they needed to fight for their rights as women as well. While the College was never in the forefront of student activism during the 1960s, students were certainly active, contributing to the transformation of women' roles. Women at Lake Forest College usually perceived their activities as fighting for specific women's issues instead of tackling the larger picture of women's roles in American society. One instance was women's fight to obtain birth control information in the Health Center. When they met opposition, women formed their own groups to educate themselves and their peers, trying to take control of their lives.

This was best symbolized by participation of women in sports. First they were simply recreational activities (even if they were called varsity teams). By the early 1970s, however, talented women brought the College recognition, as for instance when the swim team placed nationally. Soon after this women recognized that they deserved to

have the same rights as the men players. At the end of the period covered by the thesis, in 1975, Title IX was passed, giving women a legal basis for their complaints. This progress is echoed in many other aspects of women's experiences and perceptions of their roles, both in college and in the larger world.

On the Lake Forest College campus as well as others, the transformation in women's lives cannot be fully ascribed to the large movements of the 1960s. What I have learned is that deep social changes were taking place earlier, but there were some women and some events during the seemingly docile fifties and early sixties that can be seen as signals of what was to happen later. Women were experimenting with their sexuality, even if they did not speak openly about what they were doing. They were beginning to look at their sexuality as something to flaunt, which they did as slave girls or women with kisses to be bought at the carnival. Women were making career leaps small and large, breaking into a variety of male-dominated fields, even becoming doctors and attorneys. They were beginning to question whether sororities were a necessary part of the college experience, as more and more women chose to stay independent. The 1960s speeded the change and brought it out in the open.

By taking a larger historical view, reaching back to the very origins of Lake Forest College, the picture that emerges is not two dimensional. It would be wrong to claim that women at the College had never rebelled before the 1960s, or that women's roles on the campus and their future expectations were always traditional or comparable to the 1950s. At the moment of Lake Forest College's second founding in 1876, its first women graduates were exceptional women who set a high standard for those who would follow. At any given time in the College's history, there were women who rebelled

against the rules. In the years when two world wars and the Korean War were fought, women were left as the majority on the campus, and they had to fill leadership positions in the classroom and extracurricular spheres. It can be argued that this was the beginning of the women's movement, as female students tasted what it was like to control their own lives.

It would be incorrect to assume that all women at LFC were transformed by the events of the 1960s. Some resisted the changes, others observed but did *not* participate, still others were full-fledged participants. One 1970s poll showed, women at the college were more conservative than the national average, and another showed that although students wanted to associate themselves with national causes and to seek change, the truth was that many came from white, middle to upper class conservative families. Many women could relate to the causes, but did not feel comfortable joining the fight, and instead chose to silently support those in vocal opposition to war, racism, and sexism.

It would also be incorrect to assume that women's lives today are completely different from those of women who attended the College in the 1950s. The picture of the end of the twentieth century shows that today women have more control over their lives but also that there is room for more improvement. Today women can go to the Health Center and get advice about and prescriptions for birth control, or pick up condoms from tables in the waiting room. Men's and women's sports have reached a level of equality never before obtained, although the perception of the two still have not obtained the same status. Women are not limited in their career options, although business and math courses are still male-dominated. These supposed equalities that are still inequalities show that while many of the changes that occurred have been long lasting, others have

been forgotten or not strongly enforced. Sororities have again come to be a strong force on the college campus, replacing the idea of sisterhood among all women. Women faculty are still struggling to receive equal status and pay. Sexual harassment is still occurring on this campus as well as others nationwide. Much remains to be done to improve women's academic and social lives on the college campus and in society at large. But in the last analysis, the circumstances of women in 2000 are remarkably different from their counterparts in 1950, with the key decade of change being 1965-75.

APPENDIX I

List of Lake Forest College Alumna Respondents to
Lake Forest College Women Questionnaire

Students

Class of 1935

Mary Longbrake

Class of 1942

Anonymous '42:1

Class of 1946

Victoria L. Kolb

Class of 1947

Anonymous '47:1

Class of 1948

Phyllis Carper

Class of 1950

Doris Beatty Lindner, MD

Class of 1955

Elizabeth K. Hill
Betty R. Sunday
Anonymous '55:1

Class of 1956

Joyce Mathis
Denise Stehman
Lois Tovarek
Betty Tschappat
Anonymous '56:1
Anonymous '56:2
Anonymous '56:3

Class of 1957

Arlene Bitter Anderson
Illa Jones
Anonymous '57:1
Anonymous '57:2

Class of 1958

Margaret Neely Wilhelm

Class of 1959
Margie Cohen
Kay S. Severns
Judith P. Swan
Anonymous '59:1
Anonymous '59:2

Class of 1960

Rhoda A. Pierce
Anonymous '60:1
Anonymous '60:2
Anonymous '60:3

Class of 1961

Barbara Badger
Priscilla Rush Chalmers
Jean A. Major
June V. Muckle
Anonymous '61:1
Anonymous '61:2
Anonymous '61:3

Class of 1962

Anne D. Bachner
Becky Georges
Anita S. Woodbury

Class of 1963

Ann Marie Norberg
Marci Rubin
Diana A. Stokes
Anonymous '63:1
Anonymous '63:2

Class of 1964

Gerri Batchelor
Siri Beckman
Sue J. Petzel
Anonymous '64:1
Anonymous '64:2

Class of 1965

Emily V. Enfinger
Jacqueline Wallen
Anonymous '65:1
Anonymous '65:2
Anonymous '65:3

Class of 1966

Molly Hazen
Patricia Medeiros
Anonymous '66:1

Class of 1967

Marsha Feine Bodine
Susan K. Lynch
Antonia H. Mohs
Susan Rankin
Anonymous '67:1
Anonymous '67:2
Anonymous '67:3

Class of 1968

Sandra Holmes
Barbara Hughes
Leslie Wilder
Anonymous '68:1
Anonymous '68:2

Class of 1969

Maureen Sue Berkowitz
Cheryl D. Phillips
Anonymous '69:1
Anonymous '69:2
Anonymous '69:3

Class of 1970

Betsy Weane
Margaret S. Thompson
Anonymous '70:1

Class of 1971

Sheila Nielsen
Anonymous '71:1

Class of 1972

Donna Campbell
Diana M. Johnson
Carolyn S. Vaughan
Anonymous '72:1

Class of 1973

Judith A. Gates
Peggy Rouh
Anonymous '73:1
Anonymous '73:2
Anonymous '73:3
Anonymous '73:4

Class of 1974

Anonymous '74:1

Class of 1975

Sunny Lo
Anonymous '75:1
Anonymous '75:2

Class of 1980

Patricia A. Kalal

Class of 1981

Anonymous '81:1

Fauculty and Staff
(all anonymous are listed as "F," regardless of their position)

Rosemary E. Cowler
Carol Gayle
Claire F. Michaels
Ruth B. Sharvy
Ingrid Speros
Ruth C. Sproat (also 1952 alumna)
Anonymous F:1
Anonymous F:2
Anonymous F:3
Anonymous F:4

APPENDIX II

SENIOR THESIS RESEARCH: Women at Lake Forest College

My name is Jennifer Woodruff. I am writing my senior thesis in the History Department at Lake Forest College. My research examines women students' experiences from 1955-1975. I am hoping to gain a sense of the changes that occurred during this period.

This questionnaire is being sent to a random sample of women who graduated between 1955-1975. It is especially important that I have a large number of responses so that the sample is large enough to be statistically valid. I need your help. Please assist me in this research by devoting a few minutes of your valuable time to answering the following questions. I greatly appreciate your efforts, and hope that you will enjoy recalling your college years. Thank you!

If you require additional space to answer certain questions, please use the opposite side of the page.

You are welcome to photocopy this questionnaire and share it with other women who graduate from Lake Forest College.

Academics/Extracurricular Activities

1. What were classes like? (In your eyes, were men and women treated differently in the classroom? What are your memories of the faculty?)

2. Whether or not you actively played, how important did sports seem to women on campus? Which sports were the most popular? What was the level of fan support?

3. If you were in a sorority, how did you view their role? What are your memories? Or, if you were not in a sorority, what was your impression of them?

4. What other activities were you involved in, and what did they mean to you?

Campus Life/Issues

5. Describe school policies regarding student behavior outside of the classroom, and how students responded to these rules. (If there were parietal rules or housemothers, please describe how you felt about them.)

6. How would you describe the dating scene on campus?

7. What are your memories of the fraternities, and what were your feelings about them?

8. Were you aware of sexual harassment on campus?

9. What type of music did you listen to? What role did music play in your life?

Social and Political Change

10. The women's movement emerged on the national scene and on campuses during the 1960's. What were the key issues at Lake Forest College while you were attending?

11. How were *you* affected, and how was the *campus* affected, by national and international events during your years as a student? What events had the greatest impact? (e.g., national politics, the Cold War, the Vietnam War)

12. How were *you* affected, and how was the *campus* affected, by social movements? What events had the greatest impact?

After Graduation

13. Upon graduating, what were your expectations for a career? If you pursued a career or multiple careers, please describe.

14. Upon graduating, what were your expectations concerning family? How were your expectations realized or not realized/

In Retrospect

15. Most people agree that the decade of the sixties was a crucial time of change in American society. Regardless of when you attended Lake Forest College, I am intensely interested in your thoughts about those years. How did the sixties affect your life? How you think they affected the life of the larger society?

Demographics:

Year you were born: _____

Place of birth: _____
city or town state foreign country

If married, in what year?: _____

Number of children: _____

Please check the appropriate one(s):

Caucasian _____ African American _____

Hispanic _____ Asian American _____

Other: _____

Year you graduated from Lake Forest College: _____

Major(s): _____

Where did you live while enrolled at the college? (If you cannot remember the specific dorm, South, Middle or North Campus will do.)

Freshman year: _____

Sophomore year: _____

Junior year: _____

Senior year: _____

List any post-graduate degrees you received: _____

From where did you obtain your graduate degree(s)? _____

If you would be willing to allow me to conduct an oral history interview with you, which would take approximately one hour, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone Number: _____

E-mail: _____

ANONYMITY DISCLAIMER:

I promise to be sensitive to your wishes about preserving your confidentiality. I would like to quote you by name, but I will not do so without your explicit permission.

If you are willing to be quoted by name, please sign below:

_____
Your signature

_____
Please print your name

PLEASE SEND COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO:

JENNIFER WOODRUFF
LFC BOX 1226
555 NORTH SHERIDAN ROAD
LAKE FOERST, IL 60045
wodrje@lfc.edu

Thank you so much for your help!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Horowitz, Helen. *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures From the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Isserman, Maurice and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s.* New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Lake Forest College Archives, Lake Forest, IL.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era.* USA: Basic Books, 1988.

Miller, Arthur, Lake Forest College archivist, personal interview, April 2000.

Schulze, Franz, Rosemary Cowler, Arthur Miller. *Thirty Miles North: The History of Lake Forest College, Its Town, and Its City of Chicago* (Chicago: Lake Forest College, distributed by the University of Chicago Press, 2000).

The Stentor, Lake Forest College student newspaper, surveys of the years: 1909-1910 (Vol. 24), 1919-20 (Vol. 34), 1929-30 (Vol. 44), 1939-40 (Vol. 54), 1949-50 (Vol. 64), 1954-55 (Vol. 69), 1955-56 (Vol. 70), 1956-57 (Vol. 71), 1957-58 (Vol. 72), 1958-59 (Vol. 73), 1959-60 (Vol. 74), 1960-61 (Vol. 75), 1962-63 (Vol. 76), 1963-64 (Vol. 77), 1965-66 (Vol. 78), 1966-67 (Vol. 79), 1968-69 (Vol. 80), 1969-70 (Vol. 81), 1971-72 (Vol. 82), 1972-73 (Vol. 83), 1973-74 (Vol. 84), 1974-75 (Vol. 85), 1975-76 (Vol. 86).

Woodruff, Jennifer. Women at Lake Forest College Questionnaire, senior thesis research, 1999-2000. See Appendix I and II.

033 203

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
(OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Voices of Change: Women's Experiences at Lake Forest College, 1955-1975	
Author(s): Jennifer E. Woodruff	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ X	↑ ☐	↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Jennifer E. Woodruff	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jennifer E. Woodruff, Assistant Language Teacher, JET Program
Organization/Address: 200 Green Lea Lane, Albert Lea, MN 56007	Telephone: 507-373-6704 / Fax:
	E-mail Address: jenn.fer_woodruff@hotmail.com / Date: July 13, 2000

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706
Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)